

The Franciscan Educational Conference

Vol. I.

DECEMBER, 1919.

No. 1.

REPORT

of the

FIRST ANNUAL MEETING

ST. LOUIS, MO.

June 29, 30, and July 1, 2, 1919



LC
495
F7F7
v.1
1919

PUBLISHED BY THE CONFERENCE

Office of the Secretary,

1615 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio

GTU Storage





THE FRIARS WHO ATTENDED THE FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE IN ST. LOUIS.

From left to right, standing—Fr. Louis Kania, Green Bay, Wis.; Fr. Urban Freund, Cincinnati, O.; Fr. George Wetenkamp, West Park, O.; Fr. Philip Marke, Teutopolis, Ill.; Fr. Thomas Plassman, Allegany, N. Y. (President); Fr. Ermyn Schneider, Cincinnati, O.; Fr. Florian Zuchowski, Pulaski, Wis.; Fr. Berard Vogt, Croghan, N. Y.; Fr. Aloysius Fromm, Washington, D. C.; Fr. Joseph Rhode, Washington, D. C.; Fr. Claude Mindorff, Cincinnati, O.
Seated—Fr. Cyprian Paolini, Catskill, N. Y.; Fr. Didymus Storff, West Park, O.; Fr. Peter Wallischeck, Santa Barbara, Cal.; Fr. Hugolinus Storff, San Francisco, Cal.; Fr. Antonine Buch, Callicoon, N. Y.; Fr. Martin Strub, St. Louis, Mo. (Vice-President); Fr. Pamphilus Stahl, San Francisco, Cal.; Fr. Hugh Staud, Oldenburg, Ind.

The Franciscan Educational Conference

Vol. I.

DECEMBER, 1919.

No. 1.

REPORT of the FIRST ANNUAL MEETING ST. LOUIS, MO.

June 29, 30, and July 1, 2, 1919



PUBLISHED BY THE CONFERENCE

Office of the Secretary,

1615 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio

LC
495
F7F7
v.1
1919

IMPRIMI PERMITTITUR.
FR. RUDOLPHUS BONNER, O. F. M.
Min. Prov.
Cincinnati, O., die 15a Dec., 1919.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introduction	5
Report of First Conference of Colleges.....	7
Report of Second Conference of Colleges.....	14
Secretary's Announcement of a General Conference.....	21
Opening of Conference.....	23
Introductory Address by the Rev. Chairman.....	44
Address of Very Rev. Fr. Hugolinus Storff, O. F. M. Provincial, San Francisco, Cal.	46
Report of First General Session.....	23
Report of Second General Session.....	25
Report of Third General Session.....	28
Report of Fourth General Session.....	29
Report of Fifth General Session.....	32
Report of Sixth General Session.....	33
Report of Seventh General Session.....	36
Report of Eighth General Session.....	39
Report of Ninth General Session.....	41
Department Meetings.....	28, 31, 38

PAPERS AND DISCUSSIONS:

The Curriculum of the Preparatory Seminary.....	54
Rev. Fr. Ferdinand Gruen, O. F. M., Vice-Rector, St. Joseph Seminary, Teutopolis, Ill.	
The Curriculum of Philosophy.....	96
Rev. Fr. Claude Mindorff, O. F. M., Lector of Philosophy, St. Francis Monastery, Cincinnati, O.	
The Curriculum of Theology.....	128
Rev. Fr. Thomas Plassman, O. F. M., Lector of Theology, St. Bonaventure Seminary, Allegany, N. Y.	
Resolutions	158
Constitution	165
Members of Conference.....	23
Officers of Conference.....	168

INTRODUCTION.

THE project of bringing about a greater unity of action and sympathetic co-operation among Franciscan educators of this country, and of uniting in some form of voluntary association the many Friars engaged in educational work, was successfully carried into effect at the first annual meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference, held in St. Louis, June 29, 1919. The purpose and advantages of such an organization were thus briefly set forth in the secretary's announcement of the first General Conference. "It will extend to our lectors and professors the splendid educational opportunities offered by the Catholic Educational Association, in its forthcoming sessions and discussions of vital educational problems. It will bring together in mutual consultation and co-operation the lectors and professors of the several departments in order to reach a full understanding as to the exact scope of each department, and to reconstruct our educational system on a scientific basis of progress and efficiency." We may add that the unification of Franciscan educational efforts will stimulate and extend the varied activities of the Friars, and enable them to contribute their humble share to the advancement of learning in accordance with the ideals and traditions of the once eminent Franciscan school.

The first annual meeting at St. Louis was held under the auspices of the following Provincial Superiors: Very Rev. Fr. Edward Blecke, O. F. M., New York, N. Y.; Very Rev. Fr. Rudolph Bonner, O. F. M., Cincinnati, O.; Very Rev. Fr. Samuel Macke, O. F. M., St. Louis, Mo.; Very Rev. Fr. Hugolinus Storff, O. F. M., San Francisco, Cal.; Very Rev. Fr. James Merighi, O. F. M., New York, N. Y.; Very Rev. Fr. Francis Manel, O. F. M., Pulaski, Wis.

All the attending Friars were the guests of St. Anthony Monastery, 3140 Meramec St. Rev. Fr. Hilary, the kind Fr. Guardian, assisted by the Friars of his community, graciously and hospitably cared for the comfort and welfare of his guests, thereby sustain-

ing and quickening the interest of all in their educational work during the long and arduous sessions of the convention.

Every Province of the Friars Minor in the United States was represented by one or more delegates. In all, nine lengthy sessions were held and, when the Friars had completed their work of organization, it was the conviction of all that this initial meeting was indeed providential and fraught with gratifying success. Doubtless, it marks a distinct progress in the educational work of the Friars Minor, not only in the large number of important educational problems that have been discussed, but also in the spirit of fraternal unity and harmony which characterized all its deliberations. To every one of the attending Friars is due a full measure of credit for the success of the convention, and for the genuine interest and active participation manifested in the big program of educational reconstruction. May we not hope that the work so auspiciously begun at this initial meeting, will continue and grow apace, leading to the highest and best results?

In order to present a full account of the splendid Franciscan educational movement and to note the first steps that led to the formation of this Conference, we have subjoined in the issue of this report an official account of the proceedings of the two Conferences of Seraphic Colleges, and also the secretary's announcement of the first general meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference.

REPORT
OF THE
First Conference of Seraphic Colleges.

WEST PARK, OHIO, JULY, 1914.

THE first conference of Seraphic Colleges convened in the Franciscan Monastery at West Park, Ohio, July 8, 1914. Those attending were Very Rev. Fr. Edward Blecke, O. F. M., and Rev. Fr. Luke Panfoerder, O. F. M., of St. Joseph College, Callicoon, N. Y., Revs. Fr. Roger Middendorf, O. F. M. and Fr. Ferdinand Gruen, O. F. M. of St. Joseph College, Teutopolis, Ill., and Revs. Fr. Urban Freundt, O. F. M. and Fr. Ermin Schneider, O. F. M. of St. Francis College, Cincinnati, O. Very Rev. Fr. Edward Blecke, O. F. M., was chosen president, and Fr. Ermin Schneider, O. F. M., was appointed secretary. Three sessions were held, the discussions being conducted in an informal manner.

In the first place the conference is agreed that it is not authorized to pass any final resolutions or lay down any binding regulations, but is merely to discuss methods and results, and possibly to offer suggestions.

The first topic discussed was the college curriculum, and this gave rise to the question whether the entire classical course ought not be placed within the scope of the college course,—a question in which opinions differed. The consensus of opinion is that the year of Humanities is not giving entire satisfaction. It was suggested that instead of the year of Humanities following the novitiate, a year of Rhetoric might be inserted between Philosophy and Theology, but this idea was discountenanced because Theology should follow immediately upon Philosophy. The conference realizes that it here goes beyond its domain, but it desires to go on record as pointing to a generally acknowledged difficulty, and it regrets the absence of representatives of the seminary department, who might present their side of the question.

Next the class hour-plans were compared. The number of periods, or class-hours, per week is of course different in our

colleges, since boarding colleges with their equal study-hour for all students, have also a longer school-day at their disposal. Periods of 45 minutes are considered best; but for Latin, periods of one hour might be an advantage. It is advisable to combine Catechism and Bible History in two or three periods per week.

Concerning Latin, the relative values and deficiencies of Engelmann, Schultz, and Bennett as text-books were discussed. It was thought that no benefit is to be derived from a change in texts at present, since none of these texts prove entirely satisfactory.—To overcome the difficulty of teaching Latin from English, a complete system of grammatical diagramming should prove a decided help.—The texts for class translation ought to be supplied with notes, but these should be more historical than grammatical. Catholic texts, such as the Fathers of the Church, are very desirable if they can be had.—The number of pensa and test exercises should be very frequent and regular in the lower classes. In 1. Collegiate, historical Latin compositions can be assigned to great advantage, and this practice should be followed up with original Latin compositions in 2. Collegiate.—The conference urges the necessity of colloquial Latin and advises to begin with this in its simplest form from the very start. As the student advances, the classics themselves can offer the basis of conversation in class. In the opinion of this conference, a student after a five-year course should be able to carry on a fair Latin conversation.—The question of Latin pronunciation was discussed at some length; but while uniformity of pronunciation appears very desirable, this matter must be left to the Provincial superiors for settlement.—The conference holds that Latin is always to be considered the principal branch of study; however the professors of Latin should also assist in developing an English style by insisting on an idiomatic English translation.

Annual competitions in Latin as well as in other branches are to be encouraged; the results of such competitions can be announced with some display and ceremony.

In regard to the study of English, it was pointed out that too much importance cannot be attached to this branch, since this is the language of our country and men of education are judged in a large degree by their manner of address.—The Sixth Reader

of the Catholic National Series was deemed rather difficult for the lower classes, but a change does not seem advisable. A graded and systematic course in English Composition is absolutely necessary.

The study of German was the topic of a very lengthy discussion. The numerous difficulties in this branch were especially emphasized, and the merits of a number of text-books were compared. While the language must be taught from English, the professor should strive to speak German in the class-room as far as possible and supplement the English text with German explanations.

In Greek it is impossible to obtain anything better than the Kaegi-Kleist books, although these too have their imperfections. Here, as in Latin, translations of the Fathers, such as St. Basil and St. Chrysostom, are to be recommended.

In the study of French, students should be given a fundamental knowledge of the language, and for this purpose at least two periods per week are necessary.

The topic of History presented the usual difficulties. "Fredet" is admittedly too difficult for the academic classes; still there is not an entirely satisfactory text on the market. The text-book in History should by all means be Catholic, and the history of our own Order should be part of this study. The professor should call attention to Franciscan topics even if the text-book omits them. A volume of maps as a history-reference book is very desirable. Each class-room should be supplied with wall-maps to be consulted in the History hour. Object lessons in miniature to illustrate certain historical events, e. g., the building of a bridge in "Caesar," are recommended as valuable help in History as well as in the Classics.

The study of Geography should receive special attention in 1. and 2. Academic, and should be brought in constant connection with the study of History. The text-book must not be anti-Catholic.

In Mathematics, special attention should be given to Arithmetic in 1. Academic, and the importance of Mental Arithmetic must not be overlooked. Figuring two or three periods per week, two years ought to be devoted to Algebra, and at least two years

to Geometry. Book-keeping can be best appreciated and studied with greatest advantage as part of Pastoral Theology.

Under the heading of Natural Science, the conference considered the branches of Zoology, Botany, Physics, Chemistry, and Physiology, and approved of teaching these branches where it is possible.

The study of some system of Stenography, or Shorthand, is recommended.

In the study of Elocution, no single text-book can be unqualifiedly recommended. Rather the teacher must devote attention to the individuality of each student. A course of Elocution should extend over the entire college curriculum.—The conference deplores the fact that the fundamental training which is imparted at college is not followed up later on by an advanced systematic course. We would, therefore, respectfully recommend that a course of Rhetoric and Elocution be continued throughout the seminary curriculum in the form of a literary society under the guidance of the Fr. Lector, membership being obligatory on all clerics.

In summarizing on the subject of Curriculum and Text-books, the conference finds that while there is considerable difference as to texts employed, the method is fairly uniform,—the one object being to make the college course thoroughly classical.

As an essential part of the classical training, we must necessarily consider also the students' private reading. The Students' Library should be given careful attention and their reading should be controlled as far as possible. For advanced classes, the exercise of "outlining books that have been read" is highly recommended.—A Reading-room is a necessary feature to regulate the time of reading and also serves as an excellent medium of placing before the students wholesome and instructive periodic literature.

Coming to the subject of Examinations, the conference approves of two semi-annual examinations. Written examinations are admittedly a real test; as to the value of oral examinations, opinions differ.

Semi-annual reports, as well as monthly or at least quarterly notes, should be sent to parents of students.

In the valuation of notes, or percentage, our colleges fairly

agree. A student receiving less than 70% in either Latin or English at the end of the year, should not be permitted to advance with his class unless he proves by another examination that he has improved during vacation. A student receiving less than 60% in either of these branches should be considered simply incompetent to advance. If a student fails twice in the same class, he should be advised to discontinue.

The faculty should meet once a month to discuss principally the conduct of the students and to fix the note in conduct for each student.

The subject of Vocation received very special consideration. The unanimous complaint is that the enrollment of students, especially from our own parishes, is far too small. We sincerely deplore our inability to urge this point sufficiently upon our confratres who are engaged in parishes. We therefore take the liberty of humbly suggesting to the Very Rev. Fathers Provincial that possibly a circular dealing exclusively with the subject of Vocation to the Priesthood and the Seraphic Order might find a generous response.—Pamphlets, such as the little book, "My Vocation," should be profitable and enlightening reading in the hands of many a young boy.

As to requirements for admission, this conference holds that boys should be urged to commence the studies early, even at the age of 12. However it would hardly be advisable to receive boys at an earlier age. On the other hand we should hesitate in receiving boys who are over 16 years of age; and it will be well to impress upon such an applicant that he must take the entire college course. Skipping classes because of advanced age, is to be discountenanced, since the special application that this demands generally results disastrously for the health of the student. In the opinion of this conference it is not advisable to demand absolutely a completed 8th grade of applicants, since the rating of grades varies considerably in the different schools, and after all our 1. Academic class should be especially adapted to make up for deficiencies that prevent an immediate assuming of the classical course.

Another topic that occupied the attention of the conference, was the financial proposition. The expenses of our Seraphic

Colleges must be covered in part by Board and Tuition Fees, and the regular amount asked should not be less than \$150 per annum. While it may be necessary in most cases to remit part of this sum, it is not advisable to give everything gratis unless there is no alternative.—In a large degree, of course, we must figure on generous contributions of the faithful at large; and this conference is firmly convinced that many persons would gladly contribute, if properly advised. Besides the "St. Anthony Bread for Poor Students," the congregations of the III. Order might be a source of revenue. Hence we respectfully request the Rev. Directors of the III. Order to urge Tertiaries to assist our Seraphic Colleges by collective as well as individual contributions.

Looking to the spiritual advancement of our students, the conference holds that we should urge Daily Communion and insist on at least weekly reception of the Sacraments. Students should have every facility to go to Confession on any day of the week.—It must be our constant endeavor to cultivate in our students the spirit of piety; however neither must we forget that they have not yet entered the religious state. Therefore we must avoid a crowding of religious exercises and devotions, that may make the idea of piety distasteful to the youthful mind.—We should especially recommend to our students devotions to the Bl. Virgin, St. Francis, St. Anthony, and St. Paschal, while we must not forget the regular prayers for our benefactors.

Occasional conferences or lectures on Conduct, Deportment, and kindred subjects are to be recommended.—An adapted translation of Krier's books, "Hoeflichkeit," "Geist des Konvikts," etc., is very desirable.—In this connection the conference begs to suggest the publication of a "Manual of Prayers" for our Seraphic Colleges, such as have been in use in colleges of other religious orders for years past. Such a little volume could contain, besides the prayers suited to our conditions, a number of instructive and disciplinary features.

Turning to the subject of Discipline, the conference is unanimous in advocating a degree of supervision during the time of vacation; and for this purpose, signed testimonials vouching for the conduct of the student should be requested of his Rev. Pastor,

or, under certain conditions, of his parents. Uniform printed testimonial blanks might be used to advantage.

As to free days during the scholastic year, in particular the Christmas and Easter recess, students must be provided with sufficient diversion and opportunity for physical exercise. Therefore the conference emphasizes the absolute necessity, of a campus, a gymnasium, and a spacious play-room.

Entertainments of a dramatic and musical character are to be encouraged as a valuable feature in the training of our students, and should be given at regular intervals. The encouragement derived from the presence of an appreciative audience on such occasions must not be overlooked;—hence the necessity of a well-arranged auditorium.

Considering Discipline in particular the conference insists on the necessity of constant unobtrusive supervision, but condemns the system which might be called "spying." The dormitories in particular must have careful supervision. Indiscriminate association of junior and senior students must be prevented, and so-called "paternalism" must be considered a serious matter for immediate correction.—The professors must be careful to avoid everything that may in the least appear like partiality. Especially outside the class-room, they must show discretion and endeavor to preserve the dignity of their position by shunning undue familiarity.

Cyril

At this point the conference concluded its discussions with the resolution that the present report be read in a meeting of the faculty in each of our colleges.

In conclusion the members of this conference desire to express their appreciation of the educational benefit derived from this meeting; and gratefully submit this report to the Very Rev. Fathers Provincial who have made this meeting possible. We are firmly convinced that real practical benefit for our Seraphic Colleges should result from meetings such as this, if they are made an annual occurrence. We therefore humbly ask of the Very Rev. Fathers Provincial the opportunity for representatives of our Seraphic Colleges to meet again in a similar conference during the summer of 1915.

REPORT
OF THE
Second Conference of Seraphic Colleges.

CALICOON, N. Y., AUGUST, 1918.

THE Second Conference of Seraphic Colleges was held in St. Joseph's College, Callicoon, N. Y., August 21, 22 and 23, 1918. Present at this Conference were Rev. Thomas Plassman, O. F. M., Prefect of Studies in the Province of the Holy Name; Rev. Sixtus Lagorio, O. F. M., representing St. Anthony Seraphic College, Catskill, N. Y.; Rev. Antonine Buch, O. F. M., representing St. Joseph Seraphic College, Callicoon, N. Y.; Rev. Philip Marke, O. F. M., and Rev. Ferdinand Gruen, O. F. M., representing St. Joseph Seraphic College, Teutopolis, Ill.; and Rev. Urban Freundt, O. F. M., representing St. Francis Seraphic Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

At the opening of the Conference, Rev. Thomas Plassman, O. F. M., was elected Chairman and Rev. Urban Freundt, O. F. M., Secretary. The Revs. Chairman and Secretary were also appointed a Committee on Resolutions. It was agreed to discuss all matters informally. In all, seven sessions were held.

I.) The first topic discussed was the religious training of our students. The Conference recommends, in accordance with Canon 1364, "In inferioribus Seminarii scholis praecipuum locum obtineat religionis disciplina, quae modo singulorum ingenio et aetati accommodato diligentissime explicetur," that in our Colleges the spiritual and religious advancement of our students receive special attention. The course of religious instruction should be divided into two parts, the first to be catechetical, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, and the second to be given with the purpose of imparting to the more advanced students a deeper appreciation and scientific knowledge of our Holy Faith. In this latter course, apologetical, liturgical and even scriptural subjects

might be introduced without, however, anticipating the scope of the higher studies of the Seminary department. For the higher classes the use of Koch's *Apologetics* was recommended. Spiritual conferences to promote Christian Piety should be given with a certain frequency and with special reference to Franciscan spirit and principles. It is the desire of the Conference that the Third Order of St. Francis be introduced and fostered in all our Seraphic Colleges; however, prudent discrimination should be exercised in admitting only worthy candidates. The students should be familiarized with the liturgy of the Church. Gregorian chant, especially the singing of the Mass and liturgical Vespers, shall be made obligatory for all the students.

II.) Mindful of the requirements of Canon 1364, "In inferioribus Seminarii scholis linguas praesertim Latinam et patriam alumni accurate addiscant," this Conference urgently recommends to raise the standard of Latin studies in our Seraphic Colleges and to conduct our Latin classes along lines of highest scholarship and efficiency. Ten periods a week ought to be the requirements for the first year of Latin, to be followed by a minimum of eight periods during each of the subsequent years. The use of Catholic texts for class translation, such as the Fathers of the Church, is recommended.

As the study of Latin should be essentially practical, the Conference calls attention to the necessity of colloquial Latin and advises to begin with this in its simplest form from the very outset of Latin studies. Special attention should be given, in the higher courses, to the study of the history of Latin Literature by occasional lectures on this subject. Baumgarten's "History of Latin and Greek Literature" should here prove a valuable help to the professor. Regarding Latin pronunciation, it was pointed out that, since the last Conference, the Italian pronunciation has been uniformly adopted by our Seraphic Colleges.

While this Conference holds that Latin is always to be considered the principal branch of study, the professor of Latin must not overlook the necessity of insisting upon an idiomatic English translation. Again, while the Conference recognizes our traditional system of teaching Latin as superior to the modern

methods, yet it does not deny some degree of Latin efficiency to the secular schools.

Hence, in order to cultivate from the very beginning a taste for the aesthetic value of classical expression, the reading of Latin authors is to be recommended at the earliest period of Latin proficiency. The professor should also bear in mind that the purpose of Latin studies is chiefly threefold: first, cultural or aesthetic; secondly, as a mental discipline; and thirdly, as a medium of scholastic and ecclesiastical thought. In compliance with these principles the Conference, while recommending the use of one special author for the entire year, at the same time advises the reading of selections from other classics representing the same type of Latin. Cicero should be the leading text of the entire course. The second last year of College may be profitably devoted to a comprehensive study of Latin Prosody, while in the last year special attention should be accorded to Latin Oratory. Our classical and scholastic studies are most fittingly coordinated by devoting some attention during the year of Humanities to the study of philosophical and Patristic texts. The same distribution of authors will eventually prove helpful in the study of Greek and English classics.

III.) The subject of English also received special consideration. It was pointed out that too much importance cannot be attached to this branch, since it is the language of our country, our "lingua patria," regarding which the New Code requires: "Linguam patriam alumni accurate addiscant." This Conference requires a minimum of five periods for the English classes, if possible six periods should be given. A graded and systematic course in English Composition and Rhetoric is absolutely necessary. In the first year a thorough repetition of English Grammar is considered a real necessity. The use of "Readers" in the academic grades is discountenanced and instead the reading of authors is advocated, even during the first year. The study of English Literature should last two years. Elocution should be taught one period every week through the entire course. For the advanced classes the exercise of outlining books that have been read, is highly recommended. In due compliance with the "Ratio

Studiorum Ordinis," the Conference recommends that a course of Rhetoric and Elocution be continued throughout the philosophical and theological courses. In order to have men of real efficiency in public life and in the various spheres of priestly activity, the "ars bene dicendi et scribendi" must be consistently cultivated, both at College and in the higher courses.

IV.) Coming to the subject of Greek, it was emphasized that, as the purpose of Greek studies is not only humanistic but also biblical, its importance must not be overlooked. Our Colleges should require not less than four weekly periods in Greek, beginning with the second year. For the exercises the professor should not require copious translations from English into Greek, but rather from Greek into English. Special attention should be given to the study of Greek derivatives as a helpful preparation for the study of the "Sciences." The professor should also give an occasional discourse on the history of Greek Literature, comprising both classical and Hellenic Greek, which would prove a valuable preparation for the study of the New Testament in the Seminary course.

V.) Regarding the study of Sciences, attention was called to the ruling of the New Code of Canon Law and to the Franciscan "Ratio studiorum," requiring that our studies should adapt themselves to the best requirements of standard secular institutions. Under the heading of Natural Sciences the Conference gave due consideration to the branches of Biology, embracing Botany, Zoology and Physiology, and to the subjects of Physics, Chemistry and Astronomy, recommending the teaching of these branches both in the College course and during the three years of Philosophy after the novitiate. At College two periods of instruction shall be given each week. For the lower classes "Hunter's Essentials of Biology" is recommended. During the three years of philosophical studies a more thorough instruction in the Sciences should be imparted. Experimental Science conducted in well-equipped laboratories is indispensable.

VI.) For the study of History two or three periods a week should be devoted to the study of Ancient, Mediæval, Modern, and U. S. History. In Connection with U. S. History, Civics should be

taught. As text books in the study of Ancient and Modern History the Conference recommends the introduction of the "Guggenberger" or "Betten-West" series. The professor of History must not fail to call attention to Franciscan topics. The class-room should be supplied with wall-maps to be consulted in the study of History.

VII.) Regarding the studies of Modern Languages and Mathematics, lengthy and interesting discussions were held, but the Conference decided to resume these subjects at the next convention with a view of establishing greater uniformity and efficiency in the teaching of these branches.

VIII.) It was decided to propose to the teaching bodies of the several Provinces a tentative plan for the College curriculum to be submitted for consideration at the first meeting of the Provincial teaching personnel, if the Provincial Superiors deem such a Conference desirable. Assuming a maximum of thirty recitation periods a week for our College students, the Conference submits the following Curriculum, indicative of the average number of periods to be allowed throughout the College course:

SUBJECTS	PERIODS
Religion	2
Latin and Greek.....	12
English	6
Modern Languages	2
Mathematics	4
History	2
Sciences	2

It is the earnest request of this Conference that all our lectors and professors carefully study this plan. It invites a thorough discussion on this matter, especially as to whether the time allotted to the various subjects is in keeping with the relative importance of each. As the college curriculum will be the chief topic for discussion at the next meeting of this Conference, suggestions will be most welcome and should be sent at the earliest date to the secretary of this Conference.

IX.) The Conference holds that the Department System, or Specialization, now obtaining in the various Colleges is worthy of our closest attention. An approximation to this system which secures a concentrated attention and interest of the professor in his subject might be attained in our colleges. However, to accomplish this end we must have specially trained men. Wherefore, the Conference humbly begs the Provincial Superiors to accord our young men that opportunity of specialization at the various centers of learning which is deemed indispensable. Meanwhile, the Conference recommends that our lectors and professors employ part of their vacation in turning to their advantage such means of advancement in their respective branches as are offered so generously by our Universities, Summer Schools and other Literary or Scientific Associations. It goes without saying that the professors of each department can immeasurably further their own efficiency and the resulting success of their pupils by holding at certain intervals, and upon their own initiative, discussions with a view to determining precisely the scope and method of their individual work.

X.) For obvious reasons this Conference recommends the affiliation of our Seraphic Colleges with the Catholic Educational Association. The affiliation of our Colleges with the respective State Institutions was also given due consideration. It was the opinion of this Conference that instead of "College" the name of "Seminary" should be adopted. It was agreed that due regard should be accorded to athletics for the physical development of our boys. In this connection the question of military training and other eventualities, arising from the present national situation, were also discussed.

XI.) Repeatedly, the Conference had occasion to express its regret that the departments of Philosophy and Theology were not represented. Since the Seraphic College is expected to lay the scientific foundation for the future studies, it is very desirable to reach a full understanding as to the exact scope of the College work. The co-ordination of all the studies in our Provinces is the first requisite for efficiency. In fact, these days of educational advancement seem to make all our lectors sensitive of the

need of mutual consultation and co-operation, not only for the purpose of improving our own systems and keeping abreast of the times, but also of contributing our humble share to the advancement of learning and of gathering the scattered remains of the once glorious Franciscan School. There is no denying the fact that we must go borrowing from door to door, while the great treasures in ascetical, homiletical, philosophical and theological literature lie stored away in our own house. Only by concentrating our efforts and resources in systematic educational and literary work can we secure for our holy Order the place of honor which our Forefathers have accorded it. Therefore, we earnestly request our Provincial Superiors that they convene, as often as time and circumstances may permit and their zeal and wisdom may suggest, members of the various departments to discuss either together with the representatives of the Seraphic Colleges, or apart, these and other questions of vital interest. Such meetings might be held conveniently and profitably in connection with the annual conventions of the Catholic Educational Association.

XII.) In conclusion, the Conference deems it essential for the future success of its work to have present at these conferences not only the rectors and sub-rectors, or their respective delegates of the several Franciscan Colleges, but also the prefect of studies of each Province.

At this point the Conference brought to a conclusion its discussions of the various educational problems that seemed to demand its immediate attention, trusting that this initial movement for a greater advancement of our educational system will receive the unqualified support of all Confreres.

ANNOUNCEMENT
OF THE
Franciscan Educational Conference,
ST. LOUIS, Mo., JUNE 30, JULY 1 AND 2, 1919

Pursuant to a request of the Conference of Seraphic Seminaries, the Very Rev. Provincials in their recent annual meeting at St. Clement Monastery, St. Bernard, O., decided to enlarge the scope of said Conference, and instructed its secretary to announce the following:

1. The Conference of 1919 shall cover the entire course of studies as pursued in the several provinces of Friars Minor.
2. This Conference shall be held in connection with the meeting of the Catholic Educational Association, which takes place in St. Louis, June 23-27.
3. At this Conference each Province shall be represented by (a) the Prefect of Studies, (b) a Lector of Theology, (c) a Lector of Philosophy, (d) the Rector and the Vice Rector of the Preparatory Seminary or College, or their respective delegates, (e) any other Friar whom the Very Rev. Provincial may delegate.

The purpose of this Conference is twofold.

First, it extends to our lectors and professors the splendid educational opportunities offered by the C. E. A. in its forthcoming sessions and discussions of vital educational problems. By their presence at this meeting and their occasional conferences with the foremost Catholic educators of the country, our schoolmen cannot but derive much profit for the advancement of our own educational system.

Secondly, it is the purpose of this convention of Friar educators to bring together in mutual consultation and co-operation the lectors and professors of the several departments in order to reach a full understanding as to the exact scope of each department, and to reconstruct our educational system on a scientific basis of progress and efficiency.

With this purpose in view, the Conference extends a cordial invitation also to such Friars as are engaged in educational work and are attending the C. E. A. Convention as accredited delegates.

The leading topic for discussion at the Conference will be the question of "Curriculum and Co-ordination of Studies," involving chiefly the "Quid—Quantum—Quomodo." However, due consideration will be given also to other important educational problems; and secondarily, the Conference may discuss any subject bearing on the literary aspirations of the Friars.

For the present Conference, "papers" have been assigned and accepted as follows:

"The Curriculum of Theology"—Rev. Thomas Plassman, O. F. M., Province of Holy Name;

"The Curriculum of Philosophy"—Rev. Claude Mindorff, O. F. M., Province of St. John Baptist;

"The Curriculum of the Seraphic Seminary"—Rev. Ferdinand Gruen, O. F. M., Province of Sacred Heart.

These papers are to be read in general session, and the discussion will be open to all attending the Conference. However, the lectors and professors of each department are expected to lead in the discussion of the paper pertaining to their own branch of work. The Rev. Fathers who will read a "paper" are requested to send at their earliest opportunity an outline of their thesis (three copies for each Province) to the Secretary of the Conference.

The following Provinces will be represented: 1. The Province of St. John Baptist; 2. The Province of the Sacred Heart; 3. The Province of the Holy Name; 4. The Province of Santa Barbara; 5. The Province of the Immaculate Conception; 6. The Commissariat of the Assumption of the B. V. M.; 7. The Commissariat of the Holy Land.

The dates set for this Conference are June 30, July 1 and 2. All the meetings will be held in St. Anthony Monastery, 3140 Meramec St., St. Louis, Mo. There will be three sessions daily, *viz*: morning, afternoon and evening. The morning and evening sessions will be general, while the afternoon session will be departmental, each department meeting separately.

A Committee on Resolutions will be appointed to report the result of the Conference and its recommendations for educational reconstruction to the Very Rev. Provincials under whose kindly auspices the Conference is held and who in turn ask the hearty co-operation of all confratres toward the advancement of our Franciscan Schools.

REV. FR. URBAN FREUNDT, O. F. M., Sec'y.

Address all communications to

The Franciscan Educational Conference,

1615 Vine St., Cincinnati, O.

N. B.—The Very Rev. Provincial, Fr. Samuel Macke, O. F. M., extends a hearty welcome and assurance of genuine fraternal hospitality to all visiting Friars.

Franciscan Educational Conference.

GENERAL MEETING.

First Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JUNE 29, 1919, 8.00 P. M.

THE first general meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference was held in Tertiary Hall, adjoining St. Anthony Monastery. Fr. Thomas presided, and Fr. Urban acted as secretary. Prayer was said by Fr. Thomas. The roll-call announced the presence of the following Friar delegates: Fr. Thomas Plassman, Prefect of Studies in the Province of the Holy Name, and Lector of Theology, St. Bonaventure Seminary, Allegany, N. Y.; Fr. Antonine Buch, Rector, St. Joseph Seminary, Callicoon, N. Y.; Fr. Berard Vogt, Lector of Philosophy, Croghan, N. Y.; Fr. Martin Strub, Lector of Theology, St. Louis, Mo.; Fr. Philip Marke, Rector, St. Joseph Seminary, Teutopolis, Ill.; Fr. Ferdinand Gruen, Vice-rector, St. Joseph Seminary, Teutopolis, Ill.; Fr. Didymus Storff, Lector of Philosophy, West Park, O.; Fr. George Wetenkamp, Lector of Theology, West Park, O.; Fr. Aloysius Fromm, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.; Fr. Hugh Staud, Prefect of Studies and Lector of Theology, Oldenburg, Ind.; Fr. Urban Freundt, Rector, St. Francis Seminary, Cincinnati, O.; Fr. Ermin Schneider, Vice-rector, St. Francis Seminary, Cincinnati, O.; Fr. Claude Mindorff, Lector of Philosophy, Cincinnati, O.; Fr. Hugolinus Storff, Provincial and Prefect of Studies, San Francisco, Cal.; Fr. Peter Wallischeck, Rector, St. Anthony Seminary, Santa Barbara, Cal.; Fr. Pamphilus Stahl, Lector of Philosophy, Oakland, Cal.; Fr. Cyprian Paolini, St. Anthony Seminary, Catskill, N. Y.; Fr. Florian Zuchowski, Rector, St. Bonaventure Seminary, Pulaski, Wis.; Fr. Louis Kania, Lector of Theology, Green Bay, Wis.; Fr. Joseph Rhode, Commissariat of the Holy Land, Washington, D. C.

In opening the meeting, Fr. Thomas spoke words of cordial greeting and welcome to the Friar delegates. While briefly explaining the purpose and scope of the Conference, he also emphasized the debt of gratitude that was due the Provincial Superiors for having made possible this educational Conference under such favorable circumstances with an attendance of delegates from every Province and Commissariat of the Friars Minor in the United States. At the conclusion of his opening address, the chairman introduced the Very Rev. Fr. Hugolinus, Provincial and Prefect of Studies in the Province of Santa Barbara. "I am sure," he said, "that the first word at this gathering of Friar educators must be spoken by one who is known to us all as a veteran scholar and educator; a Friar who has always manifested the greatest interest in the cause of Franciscan scholarship and education, and who, from the very outset of our educational movement, has accorded to it his unmistakable support." A most cordial applause was given the Father Provincial as he arose to address the assembly. His subject was, "The Franciscans and Education," the full text of which appears elsewhere in this report. No discussion followed, but the chairman spoke a few words of hearty appreciation at the conclusion of Fr. Provincial's thoughtful and inspiring paper.

The presiding officer now asked the pleasure of the Conference with regard to the election of officers. It was moved and seconded that Fr. Thomas as chairman, and Fr. Urban as secretary continue in office until the last session of the Conference, when the election of new officers should be held. The motion was carried unanimously.

It was moved and seconded that a Committee on Resolutions be chosen by the several inter-provincial departments. The motion was carried, and the following names were presented as constituting the Committee on Resolutions: Fr. Thomas, chairman; Fr. Philip, Classical Department; Fr. George, Department of Theology; Fr. Pamphilus, Department of Philosophy; and Fr. Urban, secretary.

The matter of organization was now briefly explained and discussed, and it was voted to form a permanent organization to be known as "*The Franciscan Educational Conference*."

Relative to the question of Constitution, the secretary was asked to read a tentative plan, outlining the fundamental rules and principles of the new organization. It was recommended to supply each member of the Conference with a copy of the plan, with a view of resuming this question for mature discussion at a later formal business meeting. Friars Ferdinand, Ermin and Claude were named a Committee on Organization and Constitution.

Thereupon the secretary read and explained the plan of procedure to be followed at the forthcoming meetings, and outlined the work to be done during the three days of the Conference in the general and departmental sessions. After some discussion the plan was accepted.

In conclusion, the secretary read messages of greeting and God-speed to the Franciscan Educational Conference from the Most Rev. Albert Daeger, O. F. M., D. D., Archbishop of Santa Fe; Rev. Francis Howard L.L.D., secretary of the Catholic Educational Association, and Rev. Fr. Antonine Brockhuis, O. F. M., Cincinnati, O. A message from the Very Rev. Fr. Benedict Schmidt, O. F. M., Definitor General at Rome, extending greetings and best wishes in behalf of the Roman Curia, arrived too late for official communication. After several announcements by the chairman the meeting adjourned at 10:15 P. M.

GENERAL MEETING.

Second Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JUNE 30, 1919, 8:00 A. M.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Fr. Thomas. All the delegates were present. After a few inspiring remarks by Fr. Thomas on the importance and scope of the day's "classical" program, Fr. Ferdinand Gruen, Vice-rector of St. Joseph Preparatory Seminary, Teutopolis, Ill., and editor of the "*Franciscan Herald*," read the second paper of the Conference entitled, "The Curriculum of the Preparatory Seminary." A full reprint of the splendid dissertation is given under a separate heading of

this report. A general discussion followed the reading of Fr. Ferdinand's paper, in which the following members participated: Friars Thomas, Hugolinus, Philip, Urban, George, Joseph, Ermin, Claude, Pamphilus and Antonine.

The secretary of the Conference opened the discussion by presenting an oral report on the various communications received in the course of the year concerning the tentative plan of a "College Curriculum," as outlined by the Conference of Seraphic Colleges at its last meeting in Callicoon, N. Y. This summary showed that the Friars of the several Provinces heartily endorsed the new tentative schedule which recommends the following distribution of subjects and periods per week: Latin and Greek, 12; English, 6; Modern Language, 2; Mathematics, 4; History, 2; Science, 2. The secretary then pointed out that, with regard to the subject of Modern Language, the generality of Friars were of the opinion that the number of periods to be allotted to this branch should be determined by each Province according to its own provincial situation and requirements.

It was noted that in the tentative plan, and also in Fr. Ferdinand's paper, the subjects of Elocution and Music were not included in the curriculum. This gave rise to a prolonged discussion on the relative importance of the two branches. The Friars argued that more attention and a greater appreciation should be accorded to these very important topics. It was duly emphasized that Gregorian Chant should be made obligatory for all the students, and that the study of instrumental music should be encouraged, especially for students who are musically talented. In this connection the necessity of vocal culture, and the primary importance of having competent instructors in the departments of Music and Elocution were also commented upon. The discussion resulted in the adoption of the resolution that one weekly period each of Elocution and Music shall be made a part of the regular curriculum, and that the "ars bene dicendi" be consistently cultivated.

Next in turn, the question of what Natural Sciences should be taught in the two departments of Classics and Philosophy was

briefly discussed, but soon referred to the department meetings for further discussion and final co-ordination.

The Conference now turned to the subject of history, in particular to Franciscan History, which was discussed at considerable length. It was pointed out that in our curriculum the study of Franciscan History is not pursued in a manner that will give the student an adequate knowledge and due appreciation of the great Order to which he is aspiring, and of its glorious, epoch-making achievements; and that a systematic study of Franciscan History is to be urgently recommended.

Proceeding to the discussion of Latin and Greek, the Conference gave emphasis to the importance of these branches and to the manner in which they should be efficiently taught. With regard to Greek, in particular to Fr. Ferdinand's remarks that the values of Greek were potential rather than actual, and imaginary rather than real, a number of Friars did not hesitate to express their disapproval, and to uphold firmly its humanistic, cultural, and practical values. However, as the time was limited, and as the Conference had to proceed to the consideration of other topics, the motion was made to assign this subject in the form of a special paper to be read at a future meeting of the Friars. As a concluding word on this subject, the Conference went on record as insisting upon a thorough classical course, both in Latin and in Greek, as an essential requisite for time-honored Franciscan scholarship, and for the pursuit of the higher studies.

The final discussion of the morning session dealt with the question of a six years' classical course. The discussion was already well under way, waxing interesting and fervent, when the motion was made to adjourn. The chairman, having made several announcements relative to the department meetings and evening session, the meeting adjourned at 11:45 A. M.

DEPARTMENT MEETINGS.

First Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JUNE 30, 1919.

IN accordance with the official schedule, department meetings were held at 3:00 P. M. The members of the Conference were grouped as follows: *Classical Section*: Fr. Philip, Fr. Antonine, Fr. Ermin, Fr. Ferdinand, Fr. Peter, Fr. Florian and Fr. Urban. *Section of Philosophy*: Fr. Claude, Fr. Berard, Fr. Aloysius, Fr. Pamphilus, Fr. Didymus. *Section of Theology*: Fr. Thomas, Fr. Hugolinus, Fr. Martin, Fr. Cyprian, Fr. Hugh, Fr. Joseph, Fr. George, and Fr. Louis.

In each department the members again occupied themselves with the problem of curriculum and co-ordination of studies, surveying the educational situation as affecting their own department. Informal, round-table discussions were held on the various topics that had been referred to them for special consideration. For each section a secretary was appointed whose office it was to record, and to report to the general assembly, the proceedings and recommendations of his own department.

GENERAL MEETING.

Third Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JUNE 30, 1919, 8:00 P. M.

THE session was opened with prayer by the chairman, Fr. Thomas. All the delegates were present. The presiding officer made several announcements relating to the present session and to the future discussion of papers. Thereupon the reports of the departments were heard, conveying the substance of the afternoon discussions and proceedings. The secretaries of the department meetings were instructed to submit their final reports on curriculum and coordination of studies in the classical and philosophical departments at the general session on the following evening. Presently, the Conference resumed its discussions on the topic, "The Curriculum of the Preparatory Seminary," proceeding at once to the point in question: "The Six Years' Classical

Course." The entire evening session was given over to a general discussion of this and other relevant topics. Many solid arguments were advanced both for and against a six years' classical course, a summary of which is given in a separate chapter of this report. The arguments on the foregoing topic opened for discussion also two other pertinent questions, viz.: The six years' elementary course and the question of entrance requirements.

With regard to the two latter points of discussion, the secretary presented a resumé of arguments and statements from the reports of the Catholic Educational and the National Educational Associations. In this session the Conference adopted the resolution, that a thorough grammar school course of six years should be sufficient to meet the entrance requirements of our preparatory seminaries. No issue, however, could be obtained on the question of a Six Years' Classical Course, and, as the hour was late, the chairman announced that the debated question would be resumed at some opportune time on the next day. The following members were heard in the deliberations on the aforementioned topics: Friars Hugolinus, Thomas, Ferdinand, Urban, Philip, Ermin, Joseph, Claude, and George. The meeting adjourned at 10:20 P. M.

GENERAL MEETING.

Fourth Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JULY 1, 1919, 8:00 A. M.

ALL the members of the Conference were assembled in Ter-
tiary Hall. Prayer was said and the meeting called to order. The chairman announced that in the afternoon, after the department meetings, a short business session would be held, and that the official photograph of the Conference would be taken immediately after the business meeting. Fr. Thomas gave a brief yet luminous discourse on the study of Philosophy, thereby preparing the minds of his hearers for a fuller appreciation of the day's philosophical program, in particular, of the forthcoming paper, "The Curriculum of Philosophy," which was given by Fr. Claude Mindorff, Lector of Philosophy, St. Francis Monastery, Cincinnati, Ohio.

The chairman having expressed the gratitude of the Conference for Fr. Claude's very learned and practical dissertation, announced that the subject was open for discussion. Accordingly, the first topic that was given consideration was the proposed plan of a three years' course in Philosophy. After a brief discussion it was found that the Conference favored the idea of combining the special year of "Humanities," after the novitiate with the first year of Philosophy. In this way the study of Philosophy would formally comprise three years, while the study of Latin and Greek could be continued during this course as collateral subjects, in the form of patristic and biblical reading.

A long and interesting discussion now ensued with regard to the other subjects that should be included in the curriculum of Philosophy. There seemed to be a consensus of opinion that the Sciences should be taught in both departments, classical and philosophical, but opinions were divergent as to the precise distribution and co-ordination. After the expressions of many had been heard on the question, the opinion prevailed that descriptive Botany and Zoology, together with a complete course in Physics, should be assigned to the classical department, whereas Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology, Biology and Physiology should be associated with the department of Philosophy. The matter of working out the details of this plan was referred to the department meetings in the afternoon, with instructions to submit a complete program of the course of studies at the general session in the evening.

The Conference now proceeded to consider what other subjects should be included in the course. There was a strong tendency to eliminate all subjects not directly pertaining to Philosophy, but finally it was agreed that the Biblical languages should be taught during the philosophical course and that Church History and Biblical Introduction should be assigned to Theology. Again, prolonged discussions were held on the importance of Rhetoric and Chant, resulting in the adoption of the resolution that these two branches be made a part of the regular curriculum, and that the "ars bene dicendi et scribendi" be consistently cultivated during the philosophical course.

Much was also said on the subject of Sociology and Political Economy, on the paramount importance of studying the great social problems confronting the world today, and on Franciscan traditions and ideals of social work.

While discussing methods of teaching Philosophy the Conference, after some discussion, decided to endorse, at least for the present, the synthetic method. The arguments of those who pleaded for a more extensive use of English in the teaching of Philosophy were distinctly recognized in the adoption of the resolution that, while Latin should always be considered the basic language as a medium of instruction, a judicious combination of Latin and English is most desirable. It was a distinct pleasure for the assembled Friars to listen to a number of scholarly and eulogistic remarks on the merits of the Scotistic School of Philosophy, in consequence of which the resolution was made that our lectors of Philosophy should present fully and creditably the views and meritorious arguments of our own Franciscan School.

At this point the Conference concluded its first session of spirited discussion on the topic of Philosophy. The following members took part in the deliberations: Friars: Berard, Claude, Pamphilus, Didymus, Hugolinus, Thomas, Antonine, Urban, Joseph, George, Ermin, Philip, Ferdinand, Hugh, and Aloysius. The meeting adjourned at 11:40 A. M.

DEPARTMENT MEETINGS.

Second Session.

ST. LOUIS, MO., JULY 1, 1919.

AT 2:00 P. M. the three departments, classical, philosophical, and theological again met in separate sessions, each department discussing the details of its own curriculum. In the departments of Classics and Philosophy the final reports on co-ordination of studies were prepared for submission to the general assembly. In summarizing on the topic of curriculum in the two departments of Classics and Philosophy, it was found that a fair

uniformity had been obtained in the educational program, except on the question of a six years' classical course, concerning which some of the educators held that six years were a real necessity, while others stoutly maintained that the work could be accomplished quite satisfactorily and efficiently in five years.

GENERAL MEETING.

Fifth Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JULY 1, 1919, 3:15 P. M.

IN accordance with official announcement the members of the Conference convened in Tertiary Hall for a formal business session. In the absence of Fr. Thomas, Fr. Urban was asked to take the chair. The question of Organization and Constitution was again discussed, and the Committee on Constitution was requested to submit the various articles of organization for final adoption at the last meeting of the Conference. Next in turn, the question of affiliation was given due consideration. The points in question were: 1) The affiliation of the Franciscan Educational Conference with the Catholic Educational Association. 2.) The affiliation of our College Departments (Philosophy) with the Catholic University or some State University. 3) The affiliation of our Seminary Departments (Theology) with the Catholic University. With regard to the first point the chairman explained the conditions and advantages of affiliation with the C. E. A., reading a letter from the Rev. Francis Howard, secretary of the Association. After a general discussion on each of the foregoing points it was resolved that the Conference recommend to the consideration of the Provincial Superiors the three-fold, aforementioned affiliation. It was also recommended, that the preparatory Seminaries should award to students who have successfully completed the classical course, a diploma leading up to academic degrees. At the conclusion of the business session a photograph of the "Patres Conscripti" was taken by Fr. Claude.

GENERAL MEETING.

Sixth Session.

St. Louis, Mo., July 1, 1919, 8:00 P. M.

AT the appointed hour all the members were assembled in Tertiary Hall. The chairman, Fr. Thomas, announced that the present session would be given over to a general discussion of educational problems as affecting both departments, the classical and the philosophical.

First in point of discussion came the question of equipment of laboratories for the study of science, and of libraries as a general educational factor. It was pointed out that for a successful study of experimental science, up-to-date and well equipped laboratories are indispensable. The libraries in our preparatory seminaries and in the houses of studies should receive careful attention. They should be conducted and controlled in a scientific manner by men who are competent and interested in the work. The masters of clerics, or others having charge of this department, should be allowed a certain latitude in the purchase of books. The scientific cataloguing of books and the equipment of our libraries with "Franciscana" were also the topics of much impromptu discussion.

Attention was here called to a recent splendid publication, "The Glories of the Franciscan Order," by Fr. Francis Borgia Steck, who lately has been appointed assistant historian to Fr. Zephyrin Engelhardt. In order to obtain a complete list of rare Franciscan works existing in this country, it was recommended that this Conference request Fr. Francis to arrange, in the course of his travels, a list of all the rare books and manuscripts relating to the Order of Friars Minor, and to forward the list to the secretary of this Conference. The Conference showed its appreciation of Fr. Francis' good work by extending to him a vote of thanks. The gratitude of the Conference was also unanimously expressed to Fr. Zephyrin, the well-known Franciscan historian for his meritorious labors in the cause of Franciscan history and Franciscan Missions. In behalf of Fr. Thomas' "Lectures on Franciscan Schools and Scholars," the Conference showed its hearty appreciation by extending to him a rising vote of thanks.

At this point the chairman announced that the question of "Franciscan Activities" would be resumed at a later session, and caused a digression to other topics by promptly calling for reports on Curriculum and Coordination of Studies. On behalf of the classical department Fr. Philip read the report containing the following constructive points: 1) Thirty-two weekly recitation periods should be the maximum requirement. 2) The curriculum should include the following topics: Religion, 2; Latin, 8; English, 6; Greek, 4; Mathematics, 4; Modern Language, 2; History, 2; Science, 2; Elocution, 1; Music, 1. 3) An elementary course in Botany and Zoology, and a complete course in Physics should be given in the classical department. A course in Physical Geography may be added in the first year, if desirable. 4) A certain latitude should be allowed with regard to the number of periods in Modern Languages. 5) A thorough elementary course of six years should be sufficient to meet the entrance requirements of our Seminaries. 6) No consensus of opinion has been effected with regard to the Six Years' Classical Course. Upon this statement the Conference promptly resumed for discussion the question of a six years' classical course. Both sides, the affirmative and the negative of the proposition were heard in argumentation that was clear and forcible, yet failed to carry conviction. Finally, the argument was brought to a close with the adoption of the compromise resolution that, wherever it is possible to secure the boys after a six years' elementary course, the classical course should extend over six years; and that, where a six years' classical course is already established, it should be retained.

The chairman now called for a report on the curriculum of Philosophy. Fr. Pamphilus read the report which set forth the following items of educational reconstruction: 1) The Study of Philosophy should last three years of sixteen weekly periods. 2) Conjointly with Philosophy, the following subjects of Science should be taught: Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy, Biology and Physiology. 3) The course should also include Patristic and New Testament Readings in Latin and Greek, Hebrew, Rhetoric, Academia, or Debating Society, and Chant. 4) The following plan has been unanimously approved:

First Year: Logic and Ontology, 6; Seminar, 1; Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy, 5; Latin and Greek, 2; Rhetoric, 1; Chant, 1. *Second Year:* Cosmology and Psychology, 6; Seminar, 1; Biology and Physiology, 5; Hebrew, 2; Rhetoric, 1; Chant, 1. *Third Year:* Theodicy and Ethics, 6; History of Philosophy, 4; Seminar, 1; Sociology and Political Economy, 1; Hebrew, 2; Rhetoric, 1; Chant, 1. Another tentative plan was also submitted which provides for a complete course in Science during the first year. The chairman complimented the members of the classical and philosophical departments upon their splendid educational work.

Last, but not least, the question of the teacher's efficiency loomed up for discussion. In animated discourse it was pointed out that the greatest, the most imperative need of our present educational system is specialization. Friar upon Friar was heard on this subject, deplored the lack of special pedagogical training, and urging the need of specialization in behalf of our teachers in every department. Wherefore, the Conference again unanimously recommends, that our young men whose fitness for the office of teaching has been duly ascertained, be given every opportunity to prepare themselves at the various centers of learning for the positions they will be called upon to fill. But before concluding its discussions and observations on this topic, the Conference briefly dwelt on the moral qualifications of a good teacher, recommending the greatest prudence and discretion in the choice of our future teachers. These should be as the Statutes of the Order point out, men of mental endowments, of moral integrity, and especially men of character who will teach not only by word of mouth but also by example.

The following members took part in the discussions on the foregoing topics: Friars: Hugolinus, Thomas, Philip, Joseph, Claude, Berard, Didymus, Pamphilus, Urban, Antonine, Ermin, Peter, Ferdinand, George. It was 10:40 when the Conference adjourned.

GENERAL MEETING.

Seventh Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JULY 2, 1919, 8:00 A. M.

IN his preliminary remarks the chairman, Fr. Thomas, called attention to miscellaneous problems of clerical education to be discussed on this final day of the Conference. The reading of the third paper of the Conference now followed: "The Curriculum of Theology." It was given by the Chairman, Fr. Thomas Plassman, Lector of Theology St. Bonaventure Seminary, Allegany, N. Y. Fr. Martin was requested to take the chair. At the conclusion of Fr. Thomas' paper the presiding officer arose to speak in the name of the assembly its sentiments of appreciation, briefly characterizing the dissertation as one that was interesting in matter, scholarly and constructive in tone, and eminently Franciscan in scope.

Upon resuming the chair Fr. Thomas announced that the question was open for discussion and himself made the first presentation of the subject by asking the question: "What is the aim and purpose of the Friars Minor, and are we living up to the standard set by the Order in the past?" An animated discussion ensued in which all the members were anxious to be heard. It was urged that the time has come to extend our activities in regard to preaching and teaching the Word of God, in regard to the cultivation of higher studies and the pursuit of literary work, and that we are now in position to do so. The task of the pioneers "who have borne the burden of the day and the heats" during the period of construction and organization is fairly accomplished. Our many missions, churches, and monasteries are the result of their noble efforts and stand as glorious monuments to their untiring zeal. Shall we, the Friars of today, content ourselves with enjoying the fruits of their labor in the administration of flourishing parishes and well-appointed missions? If they, our pioneers, have manifested such marvelous zeal and sacrifice in order to establish the Order in these States, shall not we, animated by the same spirit of zeal and sacrifice, now carry into effect their original designs by extending the activities and influence of the Friars Minor into

other fields in accordance with the glorious traditions of the Order? The scope of the Order is not constrained to any particular sphere; it is not constrained to pastoral work; its scope is larger and it behooves the present day Friars with their great material and numerical strength to resume the glorious work and principles of our forefathers and to make the Franciscan ideal a living force in the Catholic world today. Let us realize the great possibilities of our Franciscan vocation and become bearers of the true message of St. Francis to the world. Fr. Thomas' paper elicited many other interesting questions, but as the time was limited, only brief discussions could be held on such topics as had no direct bearing on the point in question, *viz.*: The Curriculum of Theology.

While discussing the topic of Sociology it was pointed out that the importance of this study cannot be over-estimated. Every Franciscan should take a deep and abiding interest in studying the great social problems confronting the world today. The course in Sociology should be up-to-date and progressive, giving a thorough and systematic treatment of the subject in Philosophy, while in Theology the matter should again be treated quite thoroughly in connection with Moral Theology, e. g., in the tract, "De Justitia et Jure." Various reports on this subject from recent sessions of the Catholic Educational Association were read and discussed.

The question of Ascetical Theology also received much consideration. It was said that the methods and principles of Franciscan Asceticism are not sufficiently emphasized. What we need is more confidence and self-reliance. The glorious past of the Order proves the wonderful success of our spiritual work, and it behooves us to study our own Franciscan models and to imitate them. Occasional conferences or meetings of our missionaries should be held with a view of establishing definite rules and norms for the conducting of retreats and missions. There should be a well-defined, progressive system of training our missionaries and retreat-masters according to principles and methods laid down by the great Franciscan missionaries. The publication of ascetical works of Franciscan authors was urgently recommended. It was said that the Friars engaged in pastoral work

should not hesitate to enter the field of literature and by writing, translating, and study turn to a most profitable account those leisure moments that may be at their disposal during the week.

The subject of Franciscan missionary work at home and abroad also received much appreciation and encouragement. The Friars who are devoting themselves to missionary labors among the Indians and Negroes of America or to the conversion of pagans in foreign lands were spoken of in terms of highest praise, and it was emphasized that every assistance and encouragement should be accorded them in their noble and typically Franciscan work of pagan evangelization.

The final educational discussion dealt with the topic of Sacred Eloquence. After a brief discussion the chairman announced that owing to the importance of the topic and the lateness of the hour the question would be resumed in the afternoon at 4:00 o'clock when a special general session would be held. Before concluding its deliberations the Conference extended a unanimous vote of thanks to the veteran Franciscan scholar and educator, the Very Rev. Fr. Hugolinus, Provincial, for his manifest zeal and interest in the cause of Franciscan education. At this point the meeting adjourned. Nearly all the members of the Conference had occasion to express their views in the interesting educational discussion.

DEPARTMENT MEETINGS.

Third Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JULY 2, 1919.

AT 1:30 P. M. the Committees on Organization and Resolutions held separate meetings to prepare their reports for the final session in the evening. The members of the theological section also met at this hour to discuss the elaborate curriculum of Theology tentatively prepared by Fr. Joseph and Fr. George. At this meeting the question of Sacred Eloquence, especially the plan of adding one more year to the curriculum was given full

consideration with a view of presenting a definite plan and the reasons for its adoption to the general assembly at the meeting to be held at 4:00 P. M.

GENERAL MEETING.

Eighth Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JULY 2, 1919, 4:00 P. M.

UPON reassembling in Tertiary Hall, at the appointed hour, the Conference forthwith resumed for discussion the topic of Homiletics and Sacred Eloquence, giving full and particular consideration to the proposal of a special year for the exclusive study of Sacred Eloquence. Fr. Hugolinus gave a brief account of the questions discussed at the department meeting of Theology. The chairman remarked that every member of the Conference would be asked to speak his mind on the points in question. Pursuant to, the members entered the real spirit of the discussion with much earnestness and constructive argumentation. Each one, in turn, expressed his views on the relative importance of this branch of studies and also upon the advisability of a special year for the study of Sacred Eloquence. "We must," it was said, "if we desire to maintain that place of honor which the Friars Minor always held as missionaries and preachers of the Word of God, devote a more careful attention to the study of Elocution, Rhetoric, Homiletics, and Sacred Eloquence." In order to make this course one of high efficiency and far-reaching results, every department of clerical education must contribute its share toward the development of those who will go forth from our schools to preach the Word of God. What we need is more method and more unity. The fundamental training must be given in the college department, in the classes of elocution and composition. The same careful attention, which is given in the classical department to the "ars bene dicendi et scribendi," must be consistently devoted to the subject in the departments of Philosophy and Theology. There should be concerted action on the part of all the teachers to inculcate the principles of correct expression in speaking and in writing. The Circulus Lit-

erarius, or Debating Society, as well as copious exercises in composition should be made obligatory upon all the clerics. In the course of Philosophy the subject matter of these compositions should include sociological topics, whereas in the department of Theology the clerics should write and speak with a certain frequency on apologetical, ascetical, and sociological questions. The general work of the class-room should be supplemented by individual training in composition and delivery. Students of extraordinary parts should receive, each according to his superior capacity for work, special occupation that will be profitable to them and conducive to higher scholarship.

With regard to the plan for a special year in Sacred Eloquence, a long and informative discussion was held. While the members of the Conference were one in stating the advisability of such a course, several of the speakers pointed to existing difficulties and deficiencies that stood in the way of its prompt realization. These difficulties consisted, it was said, mainly in the lack of the necessary personnel and equipment. However, it was pointed out that by concerted action of all the Friars, by mutual cooperation of the Provinces, and by the establishment of an inter-provincial house of studies, the desirable plan might easily be carried into effect. With regard to the conduct of such a course of Sacred Eloquence, the following constructive suggestions were offered. The *special year* should in no way delay the clerics' promotion to the sacred priesthood, but should be given as a post-graduate course for the newly ordained priests and also for others who desire to receive a special preparation for the pulpit. The clerical students attending this class should preach on Sundays and exercise the "cura animarum," but must not be occupied with parochial or extraneous duties during the week. There should be a definite schedule of studies. One daily hour of class should be given, and the rest of the time should be devoted to individual training, and to the preparation of sermons, especially for lent, missions, and retreats. The class should be directed by an experienced missionary, who is, at the same time, a man of study, familiar with literature and acquainted with modern apologetics and social questions. Mindful of the fact that in every century the Friars Minor held a foremost rank as

missionaries and evangelists, the Conference recommends to the students of Sacred Eloquence a diligent perusal of the great Franciscan models of pulpit eloquence and also a more intensive study of Franciscan Asceticism. Once more it was pointed out that the institution of such a special course should not render the "ars bene dicendi" negligible during the preceding years, but that elocution and eloquence should be taught collaterally and efficiently in every department, receiving its fullest appreciation and practical application in the special year of Sacred Eloquence.

After the opinions of all had been heard on the subject, the spirited discussion was brought to a close with the adoption of the resolution that the Conference unanimously emphasizes the absolute necessity of uninterrupted particular attention to the "ars bene dicendi et scribendi" not only in the regular classes of Elocution and Homiletics, or in the Debating Society, but in every branch of study. Furthermore, that the Conference heartily recommends, in accordance with No. 255, Const. Gen., the institution of a special course for the exclusive study of Sacred Eloquence, under the direction of a competent and efficient teacher. The chairman having expressed his gratification with the fine educational discussion, and his anticipation of real and practical results from the deliberations of this session, the meeting adjourned at 5:45 P. M.

GENERAL MEETING.

Ninth Session.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., JULY 2, 1919.

The final meeting of the Conference was held in Tertiary Hall on Wednesday, 8:15 P. M. In summarizing on the educational discussions of the past days, the chairman, Fr. Thomas, explained that, while the Conference had dealt quite constructively with two questions involved, namely—*quid* and *quantum*—the third question, *quomodo*—or methods of teaching, had not received adequate consideration, and must, therefore, be resumed at the next educational Conference. The chairman thanked the members of the Conference for their fine spirit of mutual coopera-

tion. "Ecce quam bonum et quam jucundum habitare Fratres in unum."—"This," he said, "was the characteristic note of our deliberations during the three days of arduous work." The secretary was now asked to read the revised articles of organization as formulated by the special Committee on Constitution. After a brief discussion, and upon motion made and seconded, the Constitution was adopted as read.

At this juncture the Conference extended a vote of thanks to the Most Rev. Albert T. Daeger, O. F. M., D. D., Archbishop of Santa Fe, for his wholehearted greetings and special blessing, and also to the Very Rev. Provincial Superiors for their encouraging patronage of the Friars' educational work. The messages of Rev. Francis Howard, L. L. D., Columbus, O., and of Rev. Antonine Brockhuis, O. F. M., Cincinnati, O., were also thankfully acknowledged.

With regard to the special report on the Curriculum of Theology, the secretary stated that it was substantially incorporated in the report on Resolutions which Fr. George was now requested to read. After a general discussion on various points of the report, the motion was made and seconded that the Resolutions be accepted as read. This was carried unanimously. The chairman observed that, while the Conference, has no power to legislate, nor to enforce its resolutions, yet as a voluntary association, encouraged by the good will and patronage of the Provincial Superiors, it should become a valuable medium through which the Franciscan educators of the several provinces can freely discuss their educational problems and difficulties and cooperate with one another in improving their system of education. With regard to the curriculum of Theology it was urged to carry out the program as far as possible, so that at future Conferences corrections and improvements could be suggested and eventually a uniform plan be adopted.

The next business was the election of officers in accordance with Article III of the adopted Constitution. The election revealed the following result: President, Fr. Thomas Plassman, Allegany, N. Y.; Vice-President, Fr. Martin Strub, St. Louis, Mo.; Secretary, Fr. Urban Freundt, Cincinnati, O. Fr. Thomas on resuming the chair, thanked the Conference on behalf of the

elected officers for the confidence it placed in them, promising that they would lend their best efforts to promote the welfare of the new organization.

The chairman's concluding remarks were as follows:

"It is with feelings of deep gratitude that we conclude our first Educational Conference. We are grateful to the "Giver of all gifts," for we realize that we have received a distinct favor; grateful to our Superiors for granting us this opportunity; grateful to our hosts for their great kindness and hospitality.

"We were given a rare opportunity, and, I believe, we have made good use of it. We have worked hard during these three days, but we see before us the fruits of our labors, and they are an ample reward. Even if our meetings had resulted in nothing else than a sincere exchange of views, we would have reason to be thankful for the mutual inspiration and practical counsels received. But, as it is, we have succeeded in reaching very definite results. We now have a basis to work on, ideals and principles to fight for or against, as the case may be; it all helps the common cause. We find that we are really stronger than we suspected, but the most gratifying feature of our meetings has been the spirit and enthusiasm that prevailed throughout.

"Now, as we have started well let us see this thing through 'ad finem perfectum'. Let us continue to work together in the spirit of our Seraphic Father, 'in sanctitate et doctrina'."

The final meeting of the Conference adjourned at 10:15 P. M.

FR. URBAN FREUNDT,
Secretary.

In reference to the "discussions" subjoined to the several "papers," it should be noted that they are not from a stenographic report, but appear here as later submitted to the Secretary of the Conference.

THE SECRETARY.

Addresses, Papers and Discussions.

OPENING ADDRESS.

REV. THOMAS PLASSMAN, O. F. M.,
Lector of Theology, St. Bonaventure Seminary, Allegany, N. Y.

IT is not without significance that our first Franciscan Educational Conference should be held within the historical walls of the City of St. Louis. The mighty waves which the Father of Waters rolls majestically by remind us forcibly of what passes in the world today, and the brave Louis Hennepin who two centuries and a half ago sailed up and down this stream seems to beckon to his confreres here assembled to watch the signs of the times and closely to follow the rapid course of events.

Our main purpose in choosing this particular time and place was to associate ourselves with the work of the Catholic Educational Conference. We have listened during its different sessions with admiration and gratitude to the valuable instructions and timely suggestions of experienced educators. We were above all edified by their earnestness, their zeal for the House of God, and by their outspoken conviction that in promoting the cause of Catholic Education they were working hand in hand with the model Pedagogue of all times, Jesus Christ.

There are many reasons why we should now retire to our monastery and discuss "inter fratres" our own educational problems. For many years past we have felt the need of a mutual understanding which would assuredly lead the way to a more effective mutual cooperation. And we are sincerely thankful to our Very Reverend Provincials for affording us this excellent opportunity. In return let us give them the assurance and "ab initio" dispel every shade of a suspicious frown from their brows that we have not come here as innovators or reformers. It is not our purpose to tear down, or to indulge in all manner of new and novel speculation. We wish to be conservative in conserving

for the future generations of the Order in this country what belongs to the Order, and for which it has labored and battled in the past. It would be unjust and ungrateful to minimize the work of our pioneers in the States. Their immediate work was to save immortal souls to God, to cut down forests, to build up churches and parishes, and little time was left them for the cultivation of the higher studies. They "have borne the burden of the day and the heats" in working for God and for their daily bread. We venerate their memory, for they were animated with the genuinely Franciscan zeal and spirit, and we owe it to their untiring efforts in building up our houses and provinces from the Atlantic to the Pacific that we are now in a position where we can accomplish more in other fields because we have the material and the numbers, and where we will accomplish all if we have the energy and the zeal of those men.

The choice of the subject for the present conference was made at our last meeting of Preparatory Seminaries. It was found on that occasion that we could not satisfactorily determine the curriculum for our classical studies unless representatives of the other two departments were present. Once the general outline of our entire educational curriculum is decided upon, it will be easy and natural to pass on to more detailed and specific work. Wherefore, since we now have the opportunity of reconstructing let us do it thoroughly and on a broad scale, and let us do it right while we are at it.

THE FRANCISCANS AND EDUCATION.

VERY REV. FR. HUGOLINUS STORFF, O. F. M.,
Provincial and Prefect of Studies of the Province of Santa Barbara.

IT was upon the urgent request of the Rev. Secretary of this Conference that I accepted the kind invitation to deliver the opening address on this auspicious occasion. To preclude any misunderstanding concerning my presence at this august assembly, permit me to state that I participate in the deliberations of this meeting not as Provincial, but as Prefect of Studies for the junior Province of the Order, the Province of Santa Barbara in California. In the report of last year's Conference of Franciscan Colleges the formal request was made that the Prefects of Studies should be present at this meeting, and, when the question arose in my mind whether or no I should again make this long journey, leaving the Province for a few weeks, I decided to make the sacrifice for the great cause of Franciscan Education. I am proud of it that I always took a great interest in the studies of our Order. The fact that, in obedience to the call of my Superiors, I have devoted twenty-seven years of my priestly life to the cause of Franciscan Education, makes me feel quite at home in this sacred, yet difficult profession. You will then kindly bear with me, if in this opening address I speak to you, as was suggested to me, on *Education and the Franciscans*.

There is perhaps no greater power used at the present time than the secret, though magic power contained in education. We hear it announced on all sides, that education is the surest way to success. The great influence which education exercises over the individual as well as over the masses is recognized by friend and foe. However, let it be clearly stated that this vast power of education is more thoroughly studied, and more effectively employed by the enemies of God and of religion, than by the defenders and supporters of the cause of Jesus Christ and of His noble work. "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light." May we not learn a lesson from the prince of darkness, who is

again striving for the mastery over the world, and is trying to regain the power he possessed when Christ established His Kingdom, crushing satan's head? Let us look around and consider the deplorable religious aspect of the present day. Formerly, ignorance or lack of proper instruction was designated as the chief cause of paganism, the then prevailing religion of the world. And, indeed, wherever our zealous missionaries succeeded in diffusing the clear light of Christian religion and civilization, they found no difficulty in dispelling the darkness of heathenism, and making all well-disposed nations and persons embrace the beautiful truths of the Catholic faith, so replete with blessings of every kind for the individual and for society. But what was it that really brought about these happy results? Two powerful factors; the first was the divine element which we call grace, and the second, a human element, which must go hand in hand with the first, and that was education—but only *Christian* education, by which I mean *Christian* teaching, *Christian* training, the instilling of the spirit of Jesus Christ by the formation of a truly *Christian life*.

Christ, therefore, who as God knows best the great necessity of *Christian* education, gave as His first commandment for the spreading of His Gospel and of His Kingdom the duty of education. "Going therefore," He said to His Apostles, "teach ye all nations." This first "teaching" should indeed be followed by baptism which alone makes one a member of Christ's Kingdom, but baptism should again be followed by education, and therefore Christ added: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And for this work of education He promised His own divine assistance till the end of times: "Behold, I am with you all the days even till the consummation of the world." However, this great mysterious power of *Christian* teaching and education was soon understood and recognized by the worst enemies of Christ. We need not wonder, then, at the fact that the shrewdest spirits of hell have tried, and still try, to use the same great power of education to accomplish their own wicked designs, which are, first, to obstruct the further spreading of Christ's Kingdom, and secondly, to recover their lost ground and to re-establish their old domain.

An example of the first is Japan. No one will deny that of all pagan nations Japan, at present, is marching at the head of culture and civilization; it is the most highly educated of them all, and, therefore, also the most powerful, so that the so-called Christian nations of Europe might well tremble at the thought of what will happen if Japanese training continues to spread among the other pagan nations of Asia and Africa. Yet, it is a well-known fact that precisely this high culture and education of Japan proves to be the greatest impediment to the spread of the true Christian religion, and the worst obstacle to the conversion of these cultured pagans, because it is an education of spiritual pride, of false human greatness, of diabolical infidelity, and of pagan freemasonry. Hell has really succeeded in impressing its spirit of pride and self-glorification upon this modern pagan education which forms the most insuperable barrier to the Christian spirit of humility, without which there can be no true Christian conversion and education.

How the devil succeeds with his second wicked design, working steadily to recover lost ground, we can best see in the so-called Catholic countries. What power rules in these countries, where in by-gone times the true religion of Christ celebrated its greatest triumphs? Infidelity, materialism, rationalism, despotism, and spiritual slavery are all helping the greatest modern enemy of Christ, freemasonry, which at present is the ruling power of the world, and which, in order to obtain supreme control everywhere, is using education as its weapon. Oh, these enemies of Christ and of His church know too well that education is the best means to get control over the minds, feelings, and passions of the people, the means that will insure the greatest and lasting success. Therefore, their slogan is everywhere: *Educate!* educate the young, educate the old; educate the individual, educate the masses; educate the young by the godless schools; educate those of mature and old age by the infidel press; educate the individual by the masonic societies and their various preparatory associations; educate the masses by the sensual movies, bad theaters, and modern fashions; and the great masses like a herd of highly-trained, pleasure-crazed monkeys follow their mad leader, the enemy of God and of Christ—satan.

I certainly do not favor the darkest of philosophical systems, called pessimism, but I do think that, looking even through the rosy glasses of optimism at the present condition of the human race, the outlook appears rather sad and gloomy. It seems, then, that for the defenders and supporters of the good and religious cause the watchword must be: "Save what still can be saved."

To an outsider the religious situation in France, Portugal, Mexico, and other so-called Catholic countries presents a strange phenomenon. Behold, how a handful of masons, infidels, Jews, and apostates can completely rule and even tyranize an almost entirely Catholic population. But this mystery is partly solved or cleared by studying the religious condition of many foreign Catholic congregations in this country. Indeed, it must be a sad sight for every truly priestly heart to see how few in these congregations, I do not say, profess, but really practice and support their holy religion. To an inquiring observer the reason is obvious. Most of these people have no real love for the Catholic religion because they are imbued with the false accusations, objections, and infidel principles daily published in the masonic papers which they read, and in the masonic societies which they attend, where they receive an infidel and masonic education bordering on real hatred and contempt for everything Catholic. On the other hand you will find among these persons the grossest ignorance of religious doctrines and Catholic practices. In most cases their religion goes as far as their patriotism, including a few religious festivities of olden times which afford them a few days of pleasure and amusement; but there it ends for weeks and months. Repeatedly, I was told by Bishops who well knew the situation: "Save a few praiseworthy exceptions, nothing can be done with the old people, but let us try to save at least the children and the young folks." How can this best be done? By patiently teaching and properly educating them. But even in this work the chances are against us, in the long run, on account of the counter education the children receive at home, and in the public schools, which they generally frequent. If, as stated by some well-informed persons, the Latin races will, in the course of time, become the dominating element in this fair land of ours,

then we must fear that our own country will gradually be reduced to a similar condition unless we watch, warn, prepare, and act.

What, then, is the striking lesson to be learned from these very practical observations? We must be convinced of the utmost importance of education, and, as long as we do not wish to leave the whole field to our enemies, we must employ with all our might the same power of education, and that to its best use and advantage. However, this education must be thoroughly Christian, truly Catholic, and, Rev. Fathers, permit me to add, for our purposes, eminently Franciscan. Some one may now ask: Can the Franciscans rightfully claim a place in the field of education? Have they anything to show in this great spiritual domain? Is the Franciscan spirit really adapted to accomplish something worth while in this noble cause? Would St. Francis, if he were to appear again on earth, approve, foster, and promote this great work and propose it to his children as one of the most powerful means against the great evils of our day? I answer with an emphatic Yes. I even dare say: Make the world again Franciscan in spirit, and you will offer the most potent factor for the reconstruction of a sick, fallen, and dying world. And who shall exercise the greatest influence in this noble work of Franciscan Education? The Franciscan teachers, professors, and lectors, who by holy obedience are divinely called and appointed to impart true Franciscan principles and education.

History generally repeats itself. The foremost educator, giving the best possible education for all times to come was our dear Lord, Jesus Christ, who was even pleased to be called "*master*," which in Scriptural language means: a Teacher, an Educator. "*Vos vocatis me magister, and bene dicitis, sum etenim.*" But after Jesus Christ, the best teacher and educator for the masses as well as for the individual is he who best resembles Jesus Christ in His public life and work, and whom we rightly call the most perfect image of our Lord, our holy Father, St. Francis. No saint ever exerted such a world-wide influence and contributed so much to the real reform of the Christian people of his time as St. Francis. He was not a famous scientist, nor a learned bookman, nor a brilliant orator, but he was a man of God, a true apostle, a practical saint, a most efficient missionary, filled with

the Holy Ghost and with great power from on high; another Christ, a real Saviour of his time. After 600 years even fair-minded Protestants acknowledge the great educational powers of St. Francis and think that, if his spirit would again pervade the masses, it should prove of immense value for the moral regeneration and social uplift of our poor misled and down-trodden people. Let us, therefore, gladly follow this our best teacher who, like St. Paul, taught both by word and deed, Christ crucified. Let us never act like silly and ungrateful children who seek their happiness with strangers rather than in their own beautiful though lowly home. The lessons of true humility, ardent love for Jesus, sincere charity for our neighbor, due respect for authority, submissive obedience to superiors, filial devotion to the Church, and a truly practical Christian life are best and most profitably learned in the school of St. Francis and of his loyal followers.

Perhaps some might think or say: "But greater learning, more famous leaders, more highly approved teachers are found outside our Order." Permit me to answer: I gladly leave worldly fame and exterior pomp and display to others; and in this respect let us be true "Minores," "Friars Minor." But, as loyal Franciscans, let us cling to an education which is not mainly theoretical, but eminently practical, and which is thoroughly imbued and penetrated with the real spirit of St. Francis; an education which, practically demonstrating the superiority of the will over the intellect, takes hold of the heart and forms solid characters; an education which finds greater satisfaction in making virtuous men than in producing learned geniuses, and points out as our greatest happiness, both on earth and in heaven, the highest unitive love of God; an education which teaches that Jesus Christ is the center and the end of all creation and, consequently, urges us to live, labor, and die only for His honor, and His great work, the salvation of souls; in fine, that time-honored Franciscan Education, which makes us the first and best children of her who was pleased publicly to proclaim: "I am the Immaculate Conception."

And what a beautiful galaxy of luminous stars does not the Seraphic firmament present to our eyes even in the spiritual, scientific, and educational world! St. Anthony of Padua, the

first teacher of Theology in the Seraphic Order, and still the "Saint of the Whole World"; Alexander of Hales, the teacher of the two greatest doctors of their times, St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure; St. Bonaventure, himself, the Seraphic Doctor and greatest General of the Order; and lastly, the most glorious crown of the Franciscan School, the Blessed John Duns Scotus, the invincible champion of Mary Immaculate, the chosen leader and teacher of the great Franciscan School, who was the glory of the Order and an ornament of the Church for centuries. Is it not a distinct honor to follow these holy and learned followers of our holy Father St. Francis? Could a loyal Franciscan teacher, appointed to educate the young postulants and clerics of the Order, be at home in any other school than that which alone deserves the name "Franciscan School?"

Let us, then, highly appreciate and really love our holy vocation as Franciscan Educators. I consider it the most important calling of the Friars, since upon this work will depend the future spirit, usefulness, and glory of the Order. Let us inspire our scholars with a genuine love and great respect for our holy Order by showing them, with high regard, what the Order has accomplished for the honor of Jesus Christ, for the glory of our patroness, Mary Immaculate, and for the salvation of souls, both in the Church and in pagan countries. Let us be true Franciscans of the *old solid stamp*, so that our holy Father, when visiting our schools in spirit may recognize, in both the teacher and the scholars, his true and loyal children; that he may fully approve of the doctrine and education we try to impart, and that he may even rejoice in the beautiful results he sees in those entrusted to us by our beloved mother, the holy Order. And, thus, let us cling faithfully to the glorious traditions of the old Franciscan School, for this school with its Seraphic spirit and principles of education has produced such wonderful results in the realm of true sanctity, apostolic labors, missionary conquests, social and scientific triumphs, that on this score we need never be ashamed of the past history of the Order.

Christ said to His Apostles not only: "You are the light of the world," but also, "You are the salt of the earth." Others may be admired as shining lights by their superior science and

knowledge, but our educational system, besides diffusing the light of true Franciscan principles, should also prove to be a real salt of the earth by curing the infected, and by preserving the innocent of mind and heart from the evils of modern errors and from the defilement and corruption of the present lax and sinful world.

In conclusion, permit me to suggest a few principles that should animate and guide us in our deliberations during this convention:

1) "The obedient man will speak of victories." Strict adherence to the regulations laid down by our higher Superiors in the "Ratio Studiorum."

2) United we stand and conquer, but divided we fall and die.

3) A sound conservatism will insure a greater and more lasting success than continual changing and trying.

4) What sometimes seems to be an improvement is often, in reality, the ruin of what was truly good.

5) Long-tried methods which worked well should not be set aside for some fanciful innovation.

6) Do not measure the standard of your requirements in the different studies by the knowledge of the teacher, or by the attainments of talented pupils, but by what is within easy reach of any fairly-gifted student. Even a poor student should have a chance to pass the required examinations by means of hard study and close application.

7) A thorough classical education should be considered the most solid and indispensable foundation for all the higher studies.

May now our holy Father, St. Francis, our Immaculate Mother, the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the great Saints and Doctors of the Order graciously bless our deliberations so that the outcome may give us the most practical system of true *Franciscan Education* for the best advancement of our students and for the real welfare and glory of both the Church and the Order.

THE CURRICULUM OF THE PREPARATORY SEMINARY.

REV. FR. FERDINAND GRUEN, O. F. M.,
Vice-Rector, St. Joseph Seminary, Teutopolis, Illinois.

While I deem it both a pleasure and a privilege to address so enlightened an audience, I must yet confess to a slight feeling of trepidation on appearing before you. I have a lurking fear I shall disappoint you, for I am not only the youngest of all gathered here, but in other respects also the least competent to discourse on so difficult a subject as "The Curriculum of the Seraphic Seminary." If I, nevertheless, attempt to do so, I hope you will deem me not presumptuous in endeavoring to instruct you out of my meager store of knowledge and experience, but merely desirous of yielding to authority by presenting for your discussion certain general subjects and principles, however badly digested or ill suited to the purpose. I must confine myself to general considerations; because the theme assigned to me is itself quite broad and general, and because anything like a detailed treatment thereof would carry me far beyond the limits of this paper.

Outline of Paper on Seminary Curriculum.

Introduction—Nature and purposes of preparatory seminary—modern high school or medieval "trivium?"

Body—Branches of study in the seminary curriculum.

I Religion—noblest study.

- 1) Matter—catechism, apologetics, conferences.
- 2) Purpose—supernatural, pedagogical.
- 3) Method—varied—five principles.

II Latin—very important study.

- 1) Purpose—threefold: disciplinary, cultural, utilitarian.
- 2) Matter—grammar, authors (pagan versus Christian).
- 3) Method—intensive and extensive—practical, not theoretical.

III Greek—less important than Latin.

- 1) Purpose—needs defining.
- 2) Matter—essentials of Grammar—selections, not authors.
- 3) Method—less intensive than Latin.

IV English—of equal importance with Latin?

- 1) Purpose—practical and cultural.
- 2) Matter—activities, not principles—texts rather than textbooks.
- 3) Method—practical, not theoretical.

- V Modern Languages—supplemental to classical.
 - 1) Matter—German versus French (Italian, Spanish).
 - 2) Purpose—to speak or to read.
 - 3) Method—practical or theoretical, as purpose requires.
- VI Mathematics—suitable high school study.
 - 1) Purpose—disciplinary, not utilitarian.
 - 2) Matter—less extensive than in secular schools—elementary mathematics.
 - 3) Method—should aim at clearness and accuracy of thought and speech, not expertness in solving problems.
- VII History—useful and delightful study.
 - 1) Purpose—cultural, disciplinary, ethical.
 - 2) Matter—political and military versus industrial, social, etc., history.
 - 3) Method—ethnographic, synchronistic, topical—graphic.
- VIII Science—opposition to sciences unwarranted.
 - 1) Purpose—ethical, disciplinary, practical.
 - 2) Matter—elementary botany, zoology, physical geography, physics, chemistry.
 - 3) Method—empirical.

Conclusion—Question of curriculum relatively unimportant compared to question of teacher.

Nature and Purpose of Preparatory Seminary.

The Seraphic Seminary is of its nature a preparatory school. Its remote purpose is to prepare the students for life, or to give them that mental discipline that will enable them to fill their exalted station in life with credit to themselves and profit to others. Its more immediate aim is to prepare the scholars for the seminary proper, or to give to their minds that specific training which will make them competent to pursue with success the higher studies of philosophy and theology.

Modern High School versus Medieval Trivium.

Roughly speaking, the curriculum of the Seraphic Seminary embraces the four years of the high school and the first (possibly also the second) year of the college in the American system of education. The curriculum in our seminaries, therefore, is necessarily incomplete, and it would be a mistake to view it apart from the courses of philosophy and theology. It is well to bear these thoughts in mind; because they will guide us in selecting and co-ordinating the branches of the various courses, and because they will guard us against the error of fashioning our schemes of

studies too closely after the schedules observed in the secular schools. Finding that only an exceedingly small number of graduates from American secondary schools enter college, secular educators have come to treat the high school as something complete in itself. In other words, they deem its primary function to be preparation for life. The pupil is to leave school fully prepared to take up the battle of life even against the college trained student. This viewpoint accounts for the preponderance in their schools of certain branches to which we attach less importance, and for the frequent discrepancies in the methods of teaching the same subject in secular high schools and in Catholic preparatory seminaries.

In deprecating a too faithful copying of the modern system, I do not wish to advocate a servile imitation of the medieval *trivium* and *quadrivium*. This system undoubtedly served its purpose in its day; but it has had its day. Nor need we shed any tears over its demise. The world has made some progress since the Middle Ages, even in education. To deny this is to negate the possibility of intellectual advancement for the human race. Though we are the debtors of our ancestors, we are not on that account condemned to be their inferiors. There is much in the medieval plan of studies that should not be lightly discarded; and there is much in the modern system that may be fitly appropriated. The ideal Seraphic Seminary, as I conceive it, is one that meets the essential requirements of our best modern schools, yet has for its foundation the medieval system. In education, as in words and fashions, "the same rule will hold—alike fantastic if too new or old." The ideal Seminary, therefore, is not a hybrid school, a mixture of the old and the new; but, metaphorically speaking, a strictly modern building on an ancient foundation. *Hisce praemissis*, I address myself to the discussion of the curriculum proper.

The circular letter addressed to the members of this conference by the Rev. Secretary says that "the leading topic for discussion will be the question of Curriculum and Coordination of Studies, involving chiefly the *Quid*—*Quantum*—*Quomodo*." Taking my cue from this announcement, I shall proceed to enquire (1) which studies should be pursued in our preparatory

course, and why they should find a place therein. Both questions are embraced in the word *quid*, and both are so intimately connected that the one involves the other. (2) Next, it will be advisable to consider the *quantum*, or to what extent these studies should be pursued. (3) And in answer to the question *quomodo*, it may be not superfluous to add a few general principles that should govern our methods of teaching.

I. Religion.

1. *Matter.*—Of all the branches in the preparatory curriculum, the place of honor must be assigned to religion. On this subject the Report of the Second Conference of Seraphic Colleges makes the following recommendation: "The course of religious instruction should be divided into two parts, the first to be catechetical, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, and the second to be given with the purpose of imparting to the more advanced students a deeper appreciation and scientific knowledge of our Holy Faith. In this latter course, apologetical, liturgical and even scriptural subjects might be introduced, without however, anticipating the scope of the higher studies of the Seminary department." This resolution answers the question what is to be taught in religion; and I think our seminaries would do well to adhere to the course mapped out for them. That catechetical instruction is necessary in the lower classes, everybody will readily admit who has had occasion to find out how imperfect is the child's knowledge of religion on leaving the grammar school. In the higher classes, however, the student should receive a more advanced course, if for no other reason than to give scope to the growing powers of his soul, and thus to prevent religious nauseaion.

There is hardly any need of determining the quantum of religious instruction. Some danger exists, however, of sinning by defect: Considering its undoubted educational value, it would be a distinct loss to the students if the systematic instruction in religion were unduly curtailed. To secure the advantages enumerated, at least two weekly periods should be devoted to the systematic study of religion, and this should be supplemented by the periodical sermon or conference.

2. *Purpose.*—It is impossible to overestimate the value religious instruction has for the higher life of the child's soul. Apart from this intrinsic value, this supernatural advantage, it has a purely natural, educational value, which catechists are apt to overlook. Yet of all teachers the catechists should be educators rather than instructors. There is hardly a branch of the curriculum that calls into play and develops so effectively the various powers of the soul as religious instruction. The nature of the truths presented is such as to elevate the intellect while exercising it in various ways. It cultivates the habit of attention and concentration by the presentation of supersensuous truths; and fosters at the same time the power of abstraction and introspection. The judgement is called on to discover the inner connection and harmony that exists between the religious truths and to decide whether an action in a given case conflicts with the moral code. The imagination finds food in the pictures that the skilful catechist will draw to illustrate and enliven his instruction. The memory is trained to retentiveness and accuracy by frequent *ad litteram* recitations of precise definitions and answers. Also the emotional part of the student's nature is cultivated. All his affections are awakened, purified, and directed to their proper objects: love for the person of our dear Saviour and His blessed Mother; compassion and gratitude for their sufferings; hatred of sin and fear of its consequences; admiration for the divine attributes and desire for heaven, etc. The esthetical faculty is developed by the contemplation of the beauties of the Catholic Church. "The new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." The sharpening of the moral sense, which is another result of religious instruction, gives to the young man an unerring instinct, which guides him in the appreciation of the beautiful whether in nature or in art or in the moral order.

Thus we see that from a purely pedagogical point of view no subject in the whole range of studies can be richer than the study of religion. It must be so; for religion is an affair not of the intellect alone, but of the whole man. It demands knowing, willing, feeling, living.

3. *Method.*—The measure of the benefits accruing from this study is almost wholly dependent on the method of the teacher. The method of teaching religion does not differ essentially from the manner of presenting other subjects. A skilful catechist will vary his method according to the nature of the matter and the age and capacity of his pupils. Now he will employ the analytical method, resolving a question or an answer into its component parts; now he will substitute synonyms for unfamiliar words; now he will draw on the pupil's knowledge of etymology and syntax; now he will illustrate supernatural truths and abstract ideas by concrete examples from nature, from life, or from history, especially sacred; now he will make use of synopsis by drawing up an outline of a chapter of the textbook, or of synthesis by having the students write a connected treatise on a lesson. Whatever method the teacher employs, he should observe the following fundamental principles:

- a) The presentation of the truths should be adapted to the capacity of the students, or as our Sovereign Pontiff says, "The truths should be regulated according to the capacity of the child." Teachers of religion in preparatory seminaries are sometimes led by vanity to pose before the boys as profound theologians.
- b) The second principle is that of interest, the fundamental nature of which none will question. Strange to say, instead of being the most interesting, the class in religion is sometimes the most tedious. Some teachers are naturally dull; others, because they neglect to prepare for this class properly. Again, others know of only one means to arouse or sustain interest, and that is story-telling; but they can not secure attention or create a vivid impression by calling forth mental activity. All such should not teach religion.
- c) The third fundamental requisite is that the method used should provide assimilation. The learning of religion is not a memory feat but a thought process. Hence the teacher should make sure that the pupil has perceived the point at issue and has made the matter his own. Any other knowledge of religion than a knowledge with understanding is merely a memorizing of words and phrases.

d) The fourth basic principle is that the method should provide expression. After the teacher has given his explanation, the student should be made to express either orally or in writing his own conception of the matter. This principle holds even for the more advanced students. Mere passivity kills all interest and robs them of the fruits of this study.

e) Of course, the teacher will miss no opportunity for a brief exhortation or a direct appeal to the will or heart of his pupils. In fact, since all religion culminates in the union or love of God, the catechist should not merely lead their minds to the knowledge, but fill their hearts with the love of God. This I believe is in accordance with the best traditions of our Order.

II. Latin.

If religion is the noblest study of the curriculum, Latin is, in the opinion of very many educators, the most important. Though Latin deserves a place of prominence in our preparatory course, it is unnecessary to claim for it that preponderance which it possessed in the schools of the Middle Ages. There was a time when the modern languages, as yet in their infancy, were devoid of all literary character; and it was quite natural that Latin, being the official language of the Church and possessing a rich literature, should become the common language of the schools and literatures of western Europe. For many centuries it was in fact the only medium of western instruction and culture. With the development of the native languages, the practical value of Latin has been greatly reduced, until at present the mother tongue is asserting itself in the schools as at least of equal importance. Be that as it may, a thorough knowledge of Latin is not only useful but indispensable to the priest.

1. *Purpose.*—Let us first enquire why it is of value, or for what purpose it is taught and studied. In all classical schools, Latin is taught for the purpose of cultivating and developing the mental faculties, and introducing the student to the literary treasures to which it is the key. This is the general, i. e., disciplinary and cultural purpose of this study. In preparatory seminaries, it is taught also for the particular purpose of furnishing the

student with the means of pursuing his higher studies successfully and of performing the priestly functions intelligently. This is its practical purpose. No one here present will dispute the pre-eminent value of Latin as a study, and it is not necessary for me to dwell further on this topic. Only I should like to remark in passing that the Latin teacher would do well to fix firmly in his mind the threefold purpose for which he is teaching this language, because on his aims will depend the matter and the manner of his instruction.

2. *Matter.*—It is evident that, if the study of Latin is to serve as a mental discipline, the scholar must be drilled in the fundamentals of grammar, particularly, the declensions, the conjugations, and the principal rules of syntax. This systematic drill, oral and written, should be kept up for at least four years; because ordinarily it requires that length of time to familiarize the student with the peculiar structure of the language and to prepare his mind for the understanding of the classical authors. The number of those commonly read in the schools is quite small. Nepos, Cæsar, Cicero, Ovid, Livy, Tacitus among the prose-writers; and Phaedrus, Ovid, Virgil, and Horace among the poets are universally regarded as the most suitable for this purpose. Nor do I think the number should be increased—not even by the addition of Christian writers; because too great a variety of authors only tends to cram the curriculum and to confuse the beginner. As to Christian writers, it might be better, perhaps, to exclude them from the preparatory seminary altogether; because, in most cases, the subjects they treat are ill-suited to boys and their style is inferior to that of the pagan classics.

3. *Method.*—The method of teaching Latin has been for a long time the subject of animated discussion among educators. I am not prepared to say that one method is so far superior to another that it alone should be followed. It is my conviction, however, that if the classical studies have suffered in reputation as the agencies of a higher education, it is owing in great part to the mechanical and obsolete methods employed by many teachers. Is it not strange that we Franciscans, who have all along made a specialty of Latin, should have so little success in

teaching this branch? The lectors of philosophy and theology will bear me out when I say that an unduly large number of students are not prepared to take up higher studies on leaving college, because of their deficient knowledge of Latin. Far be it from me to blame our hard-working Latin teachers; they may be only the victims of an outworn system. At any rate, a change of method might bring better results.

It is my opinion, for which, however, I claim no infallibility, that Latin should be taught both intensively and extensively, and not so much as a matter of information but as a matter of practise. The study of grammar should be intensive, the reading of the authors extensive; and throughout the course, frequent, if not daily, exercises should be demanded in writing and speaking. The study of grammar should be regulated by the maxim: A minimum of rules and a maximum of practice. The reading of the classics, those sublime masterpieces of ancient history, oratory, and poetry, should not degenerate into a study of petty grammatical subtleties. Here the principle applies: A maximum of esthetic appreciation and a minimum of grammatical explanation. Translation, in the lower classes, should be arranged with a view to enforcing and illustrating the rules; in the higher classes, with a view to understanding and appreciating the authors. To attempt versification or original composition seems useless. To read Nepos and Cæsar with the boys of the third year, for whom evidently they were not written, is at least open to question. Latin is a dead language, and it will remain dead so far as the student is concerned, unless it is taught in a living manner.

It seems to me that a course, such as I have outlined, should give the average student a thorough knowledge of the structure of the language, a tolerable familiarity with its principal authors, and a considerable fluency in writing and speaking it. If a course fails to do this, it may without hesitation be pronounced a failure. Whether our present Latin courses must be pronounced such, I would not dare to say. But I do say that, if they are failures, it is owing to the incompetence of the teachers, who in the lower classes often lack experience and in the higher, scholarship.

III. Greek.

1. *Purpose.*—Greek is the other of the so-called classical languages commonly taught in preparatory seminaries. The same advantages, disciplinary, cultural, and perhaps practical, that are claimed for the study of Latin are said to accrue also from the study of Greek. To me it seems, however, that in the case of Greek, these advantages are potential rather than actual, imaginary rather than real. As far as mental discipline is concerned, even the advocates of Greek claim nothing for it that they are not willing to concede to Latin. It may be not altogether impertinent to ask, therefore, why teach Greek at all if Latin alone is able to do the work of forming the mind? Is it not really an inexcusable waste of time to devote four or five periods a week for six precious years to the study of a difficult ancient language for an end already attained by the pursuit of another less difficult and more useful language?

But it will be urged in favor of Greek that it has a great cultural value—a refining influence on the mind. Your Grecian will point to its richness in radical words, compounds, derivatives, and particles, by means of which the most varied relations and modifications of ideas can be expressed; he will call attention to the euphony of the language, its symmetry, force, clearness, rhythmical beauty, and perfection of organism; he will refer to the great orations, epics, dramas, and philosophical dialogs by the ancient Greek authors, and challenge you to find their equals in any language. I am ready to admit that the study of Greek may have all the cultural advantages that even the most ardent admirer of Hellenic culture will claim for it. But I am not prepared to concede that these benefits are actually derived in our schools. Who will claim that immature boys, unable to detect the subtleties and beauties of their mother tongue, are capable of coping with the intricacies of an ancient foreign language? Who will assert that a mere grammar and dictionary acquaintance with a Greek author is sufficient to impart Greek culture? If culture is so easily acquired, it is a cheap thing. I maintain that this intangible something called culture is the result only of an intimate acquaintance

or familiarity with a language, its literature, and its history; and that is more than we can hope to give our students in the relatively little time we devote to this subject. Therefore, let us be frank enough to admit that the cultural value of Greek as taught with us is almost nil.

There remains the practical use to which the knowledge of Greek may be turned. In this respect, no one certainly will claim for it the importance commonly attached to the sister language. The most we can say for Greek is that it may aid the student to a better understanding of English and of Holy Scripture. But for both these purposes very little knowledge of Greek is required in the ordinary student. Few are called to be philologists and biblical scholars; and for the rest the erudition of their teachers will suffice. What confirms me in my views regarding this branch of study is the fact that some of the greatest ecclesiastical teachers, such as St. Augustine, St. Thomas, St. Bonaventura, and Duns Scotus, seem to have got on very well without Greek. The thirteenth is called the greatest of centuries in spite of the fact that it knew little of the Greek language and of Greek culture. I have said all this not because I am altogether opposed to the teaching of Greek, but in the hope of drawing from this conference a clear and definite statement of the aims of the Greek course for the guidance of our teachers.

2. *Matter*.—For the reasons I have just stated, only the essentials of Greek Grammar and a modicum of vocables should be taught. A book of graded selections for class reading will serve all purposes better than the difficult authors that are commonly placed into the hands of immature boys, though I should not object to the reading of the one or the other classical author, if he is not altogether above the capacity of the students.

3. *Method*.—The method to be followed in teaching this branch is of necessity less intense than in the case of Latin, because of the much more restricted aims to be attained. Let the teacher insist on a thorough knowledge of essentials and lose no time on minutiae.

IV.¹¹ English.

That English is of equal importance with Latin as a branch of the preparatory curriculum, seems to be indicated by Canon 1364: "*In inferioribus Seminarii scholis linguis præsertim Latinam et patriam alumni accurate addiscant.*" There can be no doubt that, as a means of culture and of communication, it deserves serious consideration. Says the Report of the Second Conference of Seraphic Colleges: "In order to have men of real efficiency in public life and in the various spheres of priestly activity, the *ars bene dicendi et scribendi* must be consistently cultivated both at College and in the higher courses." It is my conviction that, as one of the greatest religious bodies of men in the United States, we should exert a greater influence on the religious, social, and educational thought of our Catholic people than we really do. I can conceive of no reason why we should be held in lesser esteem for learning than our brethren in other countries, unless it be that, on account of our bi-lingual activities we are considered not to possess that thorough command of the vernacular that one is accustomed to look for in educated people generally. Be that as it may, an examination of our English course is in order.

1. *Purpose.*—What then are the aims of the English course? It should be the purpose of every English teacher, first, to give the pupils command of the art of expression in speech and in writing; second, to teach them to read thoughtfully and with appreciation, and to form in them a taste for good reading. It is evident that the first of these purposes is practical, the second cultural; the disciplinary moment, of course, should not be neglected, but it need not be emphasized so strongly as in the case of Latin.

2. *Matter.*—Since the subject matter of English consists primarily of activities, not of information; and since it provides a means for developing ideals, skill, and habits rather than for acquiring knowledge of facts and principles, it follows that much of what is contained in our textbooks has little practical value. I do not despise systematized knowledge in the case of grammar, rhetoric, oratory, history of literary production, and the like. But

I believe that this knowledge is subsidiary; that it can actually be gained only through and in connection with constructive or compositional activities of the students; and that it should not, therefore, be made the chief basis for the organization of the course or for standards of attainment. After all, it is not our purpose to develop literary critics but to form literary artists—or should I rather say practitioners?

Needless to say, such a view narrows immensely the range of grammatical, rhetorical, and other topics that it seems worth while to include in the English course. For one thing, it relegates the textbook to the position of a reference work. Treatises on grammar, rhetoric, literary forms, and literary history are intended merely as guides in the acquisition of a difficult art, not as fountainheads of learning. The pupil should be allowed to gather his knowledges of English from texts rather than from textbooks and to acquire the *ars bene dicendi et scribendi* by imitating models not by memorizing precepts.

3. *Method.*—As to the method to be followed in the teaching of English—writing, speaking, reading—it should be above all vital and practical, not dead and theoretical. I should like to lay this down as the fundamental principle by which the teacher of English should be guided. If the saying of Goethe's: "*Grau, ihéurer Freund, ist alle Theorie— Und gruen des Lebens goldner Baum,*" is applicable anywhere, it is in the English course. If this principle is consistently followed, I fear the teachers shall have to discard much that they regard as eminently practical if not essential. Take for instance, the history of literature. What can be more absurd than to cram the memory of pupils with names of authors and books, with dates and facts connected with the composition of books before they have read and studied the books themselves? What mental culture, what sense can there be in such a method? Would the students not derive just as much benefit from memorizing a city telephone directory? The history of literature, if taught at all in the preparatory seminary, should receive only incidental treatment. So it is with grammar and the other subjects. Let the "laboratory" method be applied above all to the study of English.—Much more remains to be said on this topic, but I must hasten on to others.

V. Modern Languages.

When the modern languages are spoken of as branches of school instruction, they are generally understood in the sense of foreign languages. At present, French, English, and German, are studied all over the world as the chief representatives of modern culture. That from the standpoint of practical usefulness, modern languages, as branches of instruction, have an advantage over the classical, is now hardly disputed. The modern languages bring the student into living contact with the great standard bearers of modern civilization, and thus afford, in many cases, mental enjoyments, material advantages, and impulses to esthetic culture, which classical studies obviously can not afford. Hence, in the preparatory curriculum one or two—but not more than two—modern languages should find a place.

1. *Matter.*—The height which German literature and science have attained in every department, and the great and rapid progress of German scholarship make it almost imperative for every educated man to have some knowledge of the German language. Referring to the comprehensiveness and extent of German literature Thomas De Quincy, in his *Letters to a Young Man*, says: "Dr. Johnson was accustomed to say of the French literature that he valued it chiefly for this reason, that it had a book upon every subject. How far this might be a reasonable opinion fifty years ago, and understood, as Dr. Johnson meant it, of the French literature as compared with the English of the same period, I will not pretend to say. It has certainly ceased to be true, even under these restrictions and is in flagrant opposition to the truth, if extended to the French in its relation to the German. Undoubtedly, the French literature holds out to the student some peculiar advantages, but all these are advantages of the French only in relation to the English, and not to the German literature, which, for vast compass, variety, and extent, far exceeds all others as a depository for the current accumulation of knowledge. The mere number of books published annually in Germany, compared with the small product of France and England, is alone a satisfactory evidence of this assertion." There is no doubt that since the war, which has played such havoc with everything Ger-

man, the study of German has become unpopular in many schools, and that, even as a medium of communication, the German language has lost much of its importance. But it still remains the open-sesame to one of the richest treasure-houses of the world's literature, and as such it is of transcendent value. Without doubt, German should be taught in our seminaries before all other modern languages.

With the ascendancy of English, French has lost a good deal of its importance and usefulness as a branch of study. True, it too, possesses a rich literature; but Italy and Spain are not exactly poor in standard works,—and these are more pronouncedly Catholic in tone. I am inclined to think, however, that precisely for this latter reason French will continue to keep its hold on the secular schools, and that it would be unwise for us to give the preference to Italian or Spanish, unless for practical reasons it should be necessary in certain parts to impart to the student a conversational knowledge of these languages.

2. *Purpose.*—A modern language may be studied either for the purpose of acquiring the ability to express one's thoughts in that tongue or of becoming acquainted with its literature. To teach a modern language successfully, the instructor must decide for himself whether he wishes to impart a speaking or a reading knowledge of the language. To attempt to do both within the limited time assigned to these branches is in most cases to court failure.

3. *Method.*—Upon this fixing of aims depends the extent to which and the method according to which these languages should be taught. It is evident that the ability to speak any language can not be acquired in school except within very narrow limits. Hence, if the object is to teach the student to speak, a course of at least four years should be provided with daily exercise and constant intercourse with the teacher or other persons able to speak the language. If it is intended to bring the student to an understanding of the literature of a particular nation, an early technical knowledge of the language will be felt as an urgent want; and grammar lessons connected with translations will form the chief means of instruction. The analytical method (which

begins with the analysis of foreign sentences, and from them, by degrees, derives the knowledge of grammatical forms) has been found to be very serviceable. As soon as practicable, the student should be introduced to the reading of standard writers. This reading should be extensive rather than intensive, i. e., rapid and not too much interrupted by grammatical or literary remarks. The shortness of time allowed for the study of these branches will recommend the use of a good reader to familiarize the student with the peculiar style of several writers, instead of plodding through Schiller's "Wallenstein," or Fénelon's "Télémaque," or Dante's "Divina Commedia," or Calderon's "Autos."

VI. Mathematics.

In all modern secondary schools, elementary mathematics forms an important branch of instruction. I am aware that some of the older pedagogics, like Pachtler, would relegate this study to the college proper. But I see no reason why mathematics should be debarred from high schools, if arithmetic is taught with profit in elementary schools. The fact of the matter is, there is hardly another study so well adapted to every stage of mental growth.

1. *Purpose.*—Mathematical studies should be pursued in the preparatory seminary primarily as a means of mental discipline, and not for their practical value. To this end they are admirably adapted. For one thing, they develop the power of observation. To fix the attention on objects, physical or mental, so as to note distinctive peculiarities, to recognize resemblances, differences, and other relations—what are these but a series of observations? And these observations the student is constantly called on to make in the study of numbers and symbols and magnitudes. The reasoning faculty, too, is developed by this study better than by any other. In fact, it is generally conceded that pure mathematics is practical logic. Heavy demands, too, are made on the memory. The memorizing of formulas and principles forms no mean part of the student's work throughout the course. Even the imagination is not neglected. It has constant exercise in all original mathematical investigation, from the solution of the simplest problem to the discovery of the most recondite principle. In all discovery

of truth, the imagination habitually leads the way by supplying hypotheses, which the reason then connects with known truths.

2. *Matter*.—Considering the great utility of this branch as a means of culture, it would be a pity if it were assigned to a place of altogether secondary importance in the seminary curriculum. It is not necessary to demand for it the same prominence that it enjoys in secular schools; because our students have not the same practical use for it, and because in their case the study of philosophy supplements the mathematical studies. Yet, to secure the legitimate purposes for which mathematics should be studied, the preparatory course ought to provide a thorough review of arithmetic and a creditable knowledge of algebra, geometry, and trigonometry. To obtain such a knowledge, it is much more important to give the student a firm grasp of principles than to lead him to solve a given number of textbook problems by all sorts of mechanical processes.

3. *Method*.—Hence, from first to last, such methods should be pursued as will give absolutely clear perceptions and conceptions, and secure facility and accuracy of expression. The teacher will do well to bear in mind that ability to think logically and to express an idea in intelligible language is a far greater benefit to the student than expertness in mathematical manipulations. The former he will have occasion to use every day of his life, while the latter he may never be called on to display at all. Methods which lose sight of the cultural value of this branch and aim only to solve knotty and even senseless mathematical problems, may produce intellectual monstrosities, but they fail of the primary end of elementary mathematical studies.

VII. History.

History is regarded by most educators as one of the most delightful and most useful branches of instruction. While it is a record of the past, it is also the key to the present and the mirror of the future. One has only to imagine the condition of the world, were all its annals destroyed, to appreciate the value of this science. History deals with the facts of human intelligence and will, illustrates the principles which control the progress of

mankind in all the elements of civilization, and hence assumes a function and an agency in connection with education, without which it must be altogether imperfect and ineffective.

1. *Purpose*.—The office of history as a school study is, in the first place, to give the student information regarding the events of the past, and thus to widen his horizon. History awakens the scholar to the realization that we all are indebted for much of our modern progress along social, industrial, and educational lines to other ages and peoples. This leads to a breadth and liberality of mental tone. Besides this, the intellect must be constantly exercised in coordinating events, assigning their causes, and deducing from them general laws. The imagination, too, is called on to re-create characters and scenes of the past. Also the memory is called into play, and oral expression is cultivated. But the greatest value of this study lies in its appeal to the emotional and moral nature. The student, when properly instructed, has his sympathies aroused and attuned: he applauds the noble, the patriotic, and the virtuous; he condemns the mean, the selfish, and the wicked. Every lesson teaches him by example, for it confronts him with either human virtue or human wickedness. Beneath the false tinsel of glory, he sees the selfishness, cruelty, and injustice of the ambitious tyrant and conqueror; and in the martyr pining in a dungeon or ascending the scaffold he discerns that nobleness of soul which alone makes the hero.

2. *Matter*.—With these purposes clearly defined in his mind, the teacher will know how much of the subject matter is of primary, how much of secondary importance. He will understand that the myths of ancient history are practically valueless, and he will select for detailed study only such men and matters of ancient and modern history as have a bearing on the development of the human race. He will lay stress, not so much on political and military history—on the lineage of kings and queens, the intrigues of courts, and the plans of campaigns, but on the social and economic life of nations—industrial and fine arts, literature, education, social culture, manners, customs, etc. He will treat all purely religious issues summarily or incidentally; since they will receive detailed presentation in Church history.

3. *Method*.—Since the general purpose of history is to supply

information regarding the past, it should be taught and studied extensively not intensively. Hence, it is a mistake to insist on unimportant dates and names and facts. The teacher of dates and dots will only disgust his pupils and fail of every one of his aims—if he has any. Another mistake some teachers make is to give their pupils outlines of history to memorize. Such epitomes are worse than useless, because they kill all interest in this branch. The use of an outline is like giving the student an index to learn by heart.

The teaching of history is connected with much embarrassment and vexation, at least for the inexperienced teacher; because of the vast field it occupies as a realm of facts, and because of the great difficulty in classifying these facts or even associating them, so that they may be presented to the mind of the learner in groups bound together by common relation. Various methods of presentation have been suggested; viz., the ethnographic method, which treats each nation separately; the synchronistic or chronological method, which teaches history by periods or epochs; and the topical or grouping method, which seizes on some outstanding character or event or movement as a center of interest and groups about it other historical phenomena. I hardly think that any one of these methods can be regarded as superserviceable. In practice, I suppose, compromise will be necessary. As far as recitation is concerned, it seems to me that the topical method should prove the most effective, if not for the attainment of the best results as regards the study of history, at least for collateral culture, particularly of expression, oral and written. For this reason, accuracy and even elegance of diction should be insisted on; and the students should be required to use their own language, instead of memorizing that of the text book. Brief written sketches of personages, events, periods, etc. will be of great use in promoting this collateral culture, and will afford much useful practice also in other respects. The teacher of history has the best opportunity to co-operate with the teacher of English, and he is inexcusable if he neglects to do so.

No matter which method is ultimately adopted, it should always be graphic and animated. Hence, maps, plans, charts, genealogical tables, models, and other illustrations are indispensable.

What has been called philosophy of history, is suitable only for advanced students, as it requires no mean power of judgment and generalization. In the lower classes, the teacher should be content with a simple narrative of events; in the higher classes, he may and should advert to causal relations. But he should not lose himself and his class in a maze of abstractions and generalizations.

VIII. Sciences.

I now come to a branch of the preparatory course which is viewed with distrust by some Catholic educators. It is that branch of knowledge which relates to the physical world and its phenomena, and which is commonly called natural science. There can be no doubt that in many secular schools the importance of this subject is unduly emphasized to the detriment of other studies. Whether it is because of this fact or because of the confusion introduced by the use of the word "science," the fact is that some Catholic educationists have been loth to admit the value of science as a branch of elementary instruction. They argue that science, or a scientific knowledge of a subject, is a knowledge of the laws which harmonize and explain its various phenomena. Science goes beyond mere appearances to the discovery of general truths and laws. This process requires the highest intellectual effort, to which only a mature mind can be equal. Now, it is plain that, in this strict sense of the term, science can not be taught in preparatory schools. But taken in the wider meaning of nature-study, it may and should be taught. There are certain phenomena and laws of nature which even a child can understand, and these furnish the subject matter of elementary science. That the study of nature has a great pedagogical value, and that for this reason it deserves a place in the seminary curriculum, is now admitted by all save a few ultra-conservative educators.

1. *Purpose.*—What then is the value or the purpose of nature study? Its ethical value consists in this that it leads from nature to nature's God. Nature presents herself to the observing eye as the embodiment, now of law, now of force, now of beauty; but no matter how she presents herself, her message is ever the same:

Sursum corda. The disciplinary value of this study lies in the fact that it cultivates in the student habits of observation and coordination. Its chief practical value is the proper understanding of the material and physical conditions of man's existence, and a rational care of his body. If there is any truth in these contentions, it will be apparent that training in the natural sciences can not be commenced too early in life; because the spirit of the training is such that it should imbue the entire mental culture of the student; and, furthermore, if this early training has been neglected, the study of science in an advanced period of the student's education, will not be so successful, owing to his lack of vivid conception, which can only be acquired by the exercise of the observing faculty in early life. There is no reason why of all books the book of nature should remain closed to the student at an age when he is most apt to profit by its teachings.

2. *Matter.*—But which natural sciences shall be taught in the preparatory seminary, and to what extent? That is the crucial question. Opinions on these subjects will necessarily differ until agreement as to the meaning of terms is reached. We have seen that all sciences call for processes of thought which can be reasonably expected only in mature minds. Yet separate facts in all the sciences can be made the subject matter of useful instruction even in the case of very young children. At the same time, it is true that the facts of some sciences are much more complicated than those of others. Hence, there is wisdom in teaching them in a certain order. Botany, for instance, is one of the simplest sciences. The child is interested in examining the form and structure of the plant and its growth and function. In other words, the boy learns the rudiments of morphology and physiology of plants. From the study of the plant it is an easy step to the observation of the lower animals. Thus the child is introduced to zoology, which together with botany may be classed under the head of "General Biology." The study of plant and animal life naturally leads the mind to enquire into the conditions of this life. Here physical geography, formerly known as geology, and physics, also called natural philosophy, should engage the student's attention. From the processes of mechanical motion (treated in

physics), he should advance to the processes of chemical motion (dealt with in chemistry).

Some may regard this as a very ambitious program; and they may wish to know how all these sciences will find room in our already crowded curriculum. But when it is remembered that these branches are to be treated as subjects of elementary instruction, not departments of higher education; and that only the rudiments of these sciences are to be imparted, the program will not appear so formidable after all. In view of the vast mass of facts accumulating from every field of scientific investigation, it is impossible for any human mind to grasp all the details of even a single branch. The question, therefore, presents itself: Just how far is the student of the preparatory seminary to pursue the study of the natural sciences. The following considerations may aid the teacher in defining their scope: a) that the student by experience in some few sciences should become acquainted with the principles on which these are pursued, and therefrom learn the value of scientific training and knowledge; b) that he should understand the general scope of the various sciences; c) that he should be familiarized with the broad generalizations of science; d) that he should not be ignorant of such common scientific details as occur to us every day and have an immediate and direct connection with our welfare; e) that he should be taught how to obtain information by reference and how to distinguish between probability and certitude.

3. *Method.*—In teaching science there is only one method that holds out any hope of success, and that is the so-called observation method. Any other spells egregious failure. Some teachers labor under the delusion that they are actually teaching science, when they are merely teaching a textbook on science. Can anything be more useless or senseless than to cram a boy's memory with all sorts of technical terms—with Latin and Greek names of objects which have absolutely no connection with his experience? This is teaching science with the science left out. Let the teacher remember that it is not his duty to develop scientists or even to impart information but merely to guide the pupil in the self-acquirement of knowledge. Let him be assured that textbooks on elementary science are practically useless, except as

reference works to explain such points as the student can not elucidate by his own efforts of observation and experimentation. But I realize that a teacher who has only a textbook knowledge—and that a very imperfect one—of his subject, must be hard put to it. Without his manual, he would be hopelessly lost.

As I have already stated, the observation method alone will lead to results in the study of science. The teacher must select for consideration those portions or phenomena of science which will be most educative; and he must treat them in such a way as to interest the student and make him take an active part in ascertaining the facts of nature. In a word, the student must conquer every step in science by personal observation and experience. The teacher's office is to aid him in the discovery of general truths. As all nature study is necessarily objective, it is the duty of the instructor at every stage of science teaching to supplement nature, not to take her place. Hence, he will instruct the student to go to nature, whenever possible, for subjects of research and to study them in themselves, i. e., their forms, their parts, their functions, and their relations to other individuals of the same species. He will teach the student how to dissect, remodel, and sketch objects of nature for the purpose of finding out their structure.

To provide for a sufficient number of less common specimens, the teacher will find it necessary to have a school garden together with an aquarium, a terrarium, and a herbarium. For the teaching of physics and chemistry a well-equipped laboratory will be found indispensable; and for general class work a stereopticon will prove very serviceable. The student should be further encouraged to make his own collection of plants and insects and minerals. This will stimulate interest and activity on his part. In fact, in all observations and experiments, the student himself must be the prime agent. The teacher's sole function is to guide him by his technical knowledge and experience. Let me repeat for the sake of emphasis that the only proper method of science teaching is empiricism.

Conclusion.

Reverend Fathers, I have come to the end of the list of subjects commonly taught in preparatory seminaries. As I stated explicitly in the beginning, it was not my intention to enlighten you or to set you right on the matter of the curriculum, but merely to supply you with material for discussion. I am aware that some of my statements must have sounded crude and ill-advised to you. I beg you, however, to remember my purpose and the vastness of my subject. Had the latter been less vast, it might have been possible for me to explain myself more fully and to avoid misconceptions. But the nature of my theme compelled me to be suggestive rather than exhaustive. I have attempted to give you an outline of what I conceive to be a suitable, if not ideal, curriculum for our Seraphic Seminaries. It is quite possible that our present curricula need revision.

But let us not expect too much from such an attempted betterment. All talk about curriculum and education will have but slight beneficial results, so long as we neglect to provide for each branch and class competent teachers. To quote an eminent educationist: "The making of a curriculum, the making of a hundred thousand curricula, and all the meetings of all the educational associations, with all the speeches and plans and recommendations, and all the fine buildings and the pictures of those buildings, and all the reports with endless figures and schedules and diagrams—all this will not make a teacher. Any thoroughly equipped teacher can draft a curriculum. No curriculum drafted or to be drafted can provide us with a teacher. A real teacher, without a line of printed curriculum, can give a very good education. A curriculum without a real teacher will be apt to result only in confusion worse confounded."

I hope you will not deem me impertinent when I ask: Is our average seminary professor a real teacher? There is no doubt that some teachers in our Seraphic Seminaries are doing very creditable work. But that should not blind any one to the fact that generally speaking the young Fathers that are sent to teach there are not sufficiently equipped for their task. "Small Latin and less Greek," a modicum of English, a minimum of science,

and a maximum of self-confidence—or shall I call it humility?—is about all the equipment they can call their own. Without any preparation, either technical or pedagogical, the young tutor is permitted, apparently to teach, but in reality to experiment on his helpless and patient charges. After several years of “practice,” both he and his pupils begin to notice that “something is rotten in the state of Denmark.” What can it be? Of course, the textbook is in fault. Accordingly, the college authorities are prevailed on to introduce a new one. And now begins another period of experimentation, which not unfrequently ends in the removal of the teacher from the scene of his inglorious activities. Another young Father is sent to take his place; and the tragedy begins anew. I say tragedy, because all the while our Seraphic youth are suffering great and irreparable harm from the inefficiency of their teachers. Under such conditions, of what use is the best curriculum in the world?

Reverend Fathers, I have said all this in no carping spirit. I merely wish to call attention publicly to what to me seems an intolerable condition of affairs. I know full well that the authorities are trying their best to remedy the existing evil. Proof thereof is their willingness to allow us to meet annually for the purpose of elevating the standard of our schools and increasing the efficiency of our teaching personnel. I am confident that, far from resenting, they will rather welcome any suggestion we shall have to make as to the methods of securing the best results in educating our young men. It is for us to find a *modus operandi* that will meet all the requirements of a first class preparatory seminary. We should be satisfied with nothing less. The cause of Seraphic education is worthy of every effort and every sacrifice we may be called upon to make.

DISCUSSION.

FR. CLAUDE:—The necessity of Chant throughout the whole curriculum for the cultivation and development of the voice is acknowledged by all who have had any experience as teachers or priests. There is no need to develop that theme any farther. I would like to add a word in favor of Music in general and Instrumental Music in particular.

“Music is the poetry of sound. It provides a pleasure all its own.

pure and elevating, unalloyed and free from all wickedness. It contributes more than any other art to the general cheerfulness, entertainment and enjoyment of young and old. No recreation is complete without it. It creates an air of satisfaction and contentment, a spirit of harmony and good-will, where all else might fail. It has given enjoyment to our soldiers in camp, it accompanied them over-sea, even to the trenches, and it consoled many a one on his bed of agony.

Music is a universal language and a sign of civilization, and the quality of a nation's music is an indication of its culture. In short: it is a friend at home, an introduction abroad, in solitude a consolation, and in society an ornament.

But more than that, it is a real educational factor physically, intellectually and morally. The lungs and diaphragm are developed by playing wind-instruments, the fingers by string-instruments; the eye and the ear by the reading and sound of the music, articulation and modulation are improved by singing, the imagination by flights of melody and depths of harmony, the intellect by the laws of music and unity of composition; and, last but not least, the will is influenced by its moral force, its strength or gentleness, its purity, its constancy, its completeness and harmony, and everything that goes to make up the beauty of music.

Judge from this, how a priest can use a knowledge of music for his own recreation or that of the community; how useful it may be to him in the classroom to enliven and interest his pupils; how in the church it can serve admirably as a vehicle of religious truth and of prayerful devotion. A song in the hearts and memories of his people is a bank-account of religious feeling, on which he can draw at any time, and instead of diminishing the capital thereby, he really increases it. But why dwell on this any longer? A Franciscan, a Troubadour of the Lord, a follower of the Song-poet, St. Francis,—without a love for Music,—is an anomaly.

Therefore I maintain, "Pates Conscripti," and advocate most emphatically, that a taste for Music be cultivated among our students and clerics; that they be instructed not only in Chant, but also in Instrumental Music, as far as their talents and time will allow; that every student and cleric be expected to learn at least the rudiments of Music, and if possible the playing of some instrument, so that he can help himself or others, when necessity demands. For, if to a man of culture some knowledge of Music is a pleasure and an education, to the student and cleric as well as to the teacher and the priest it is more or less a necessity.

"FR. FERDINAND:—I should like to call to the attention of this Conference the necessity of a systematic study of Franciscan history. So far as I know, our present curricula have no place for this important branch. To teach Franciscan history in any but an incidental way to the

Franciscan boys of our preparatory seminaries seems to me inexpedient, since the average boy can see no particular reason why he should be more interested in one Order than in another. Besides, there is danger that the boys may regard the teaching of Franciscan history as a form of propaganda. Thus this branch in the preparatory curriculum would defeat its own purpose. To take the history of the Order in connection with general Church history seems just as inadvisable; because the latter branch is commonly taught at a time when the training of the clerics is all but completed. The proper time for a systematic study of Franciscan history, in my opinion, is the year of the novitiate. It fits in very well with the other subjects commonly taught in the novitiate, and I have no doubt the novices will take to it and derive benefit and inspiration from it.

Fr. Francis Borgia Steck, who is tolerably well versed in the history of the Order, has published a pamphlet, entitled "Glories of the Franciscan Order." It is a booklet of some 75 pages, and tells of the glorious achievements of our branch of the Order in almost all fields of human endeavor. Though critically written, it omits everything that might be *piis auribus offensivum*. But this circumstance rather enhances its value as a text. I shall be glad to mail a copy of Fr. Francis's pamphlet to every member of this Conference.

In this connection, I should like to observe that Fr. Francis has been appointed assistant to Fr. Zephyrin Engelhardt, and in this capacity he is going to make a tour of the Southwest. May I not suggest to this Conference to request him to make a list of all the rare books and manuscripts, relating to the Franciscan Order, that he may come across in his travels, and to send this list to the Reverend Secretary? I think this would aid us materially in completing our proposed list of rare Franciscan works existing in this country.

FR. URBAN:—There is one point in the splendid paper that was read this morning on the Curriculum of the Preparatory Seminary which should not go unchallenged, and that is the assertion that "the values of Greek are potential rather than actual, and imaginary rather than real."

That the values of Greek are not merely potential and imaginary has been pointed out in a series of recent articles in the "America" and in the "Classical Weekly." Here is an expression by Charles A. Dana, the great **Greek**, journalist, to the same effect: "Give the young men (who are entering upon journalism) a first class course of general education; and if I could have my own way, every young man who is going to be a newspaper man, and who is not absolutely rebellious against it, should learn Greek and Latin after the good old fashion. I would rather take a young fellow who knows Ajax of Sophocles, and who has read Tacitus, and who can scan every Ode of Horace,—I would rather take him to report a prize-fight, or a spelling match, for instance, than to take one

who has never had these advantages." Latin and Greek form two of the principal studies in every preparatory Seminary. According to received traditions the study of these languages has so far proved to be the best means of imparting the best mental culture. They are the best preparation for the study of Philosophy and Theology. It can not be denied that the students' study and knowledge of the ecclesiastical branches will receive an increase of practical value from the classical training and culture which preceded them. The prejudices against Greek, in particular, are superficial and unscholarly. If Greek were taught and studied more thoroughly, and if the men who should uphold the genuine values of classical training and culture would do so with regard to both Latin and Greek, this prejudice would soon be reduced to a minimum. However, as this question of *Cui bono?*—the study of Greek—cannot be treated satisfactorily in a brief discussion, it would be profitable to all, even to "conscientious objectors" to resume this point of our discussion at one of our future meetings and to assign a special paper on the *cur, quantum, and quomodo* of Greek studies. Furthermore, this Conference must not fail to go on record as advocating a thorough classical course both in Latin and in Greek. Time-honored Franciscan scholarship demands such an expression.

FR. HUGH:—Permit me to make a few general remarks about the duration of the various courses of studies which are made in preparation for the holy priesthood. Of course, nobody will deny, one can study more at the Preparatory Seminary in six years than in five; more in three years of Philosophy than in two; more in five years of the Theological course than in four. Hence, in theory it is certainly very easy to add one year to each course of studies and behold, the studies in the Franciscan Provinces of the United States are reformed and perfected by a single stroke. Yet, besides the practical difficulties of carrying out such theories and ideas, I find other points worthy of profound consideration.

First of all, there is the youthfulness and immaturity of mind in the aspirant to the holy priesthood. Is there not a danger from this source of overloading the young man, not in the sense that he studies

**Length of Course
of Study.** too much, but that from the superabundance of the same mental food a certain satiety will ensue, which will render him dull, indolent, possibly sluggish in the long run? We all know how we felt as clerics. We were anxious to finish the various courses and get into the next. Let us take the young men as they are.

Besides, studies are only a means to the end of making good priests and surely there are other qualities in the young man that will make for a good and successful worker in the vineyard of the Lord apart from the advancement in studies. These qualities of character, these talents for the

various duties and offices of the priesthood are, in my humble opinion, so much more telling in their bearing on the development of the priestly candidate, that in the normal state of things one year's course more or less in one particular branch seems rather trivial. Yes, I could pick out a few among the members of the present conference, who did not even follow the ordinary course of studies as hitherto prescribed, whose studies, in fact, were very much abbreviated and yet, they now stand before us as Lectors in the various Provinces and have been sent to this conference as representative men of studies.

Keeping a young man back from his priestly goal two or three years seems unjustifiable, considering the brevity of human life and the importance of priestly activity compared with the mere preparation for the priesthood. I certainly would think it cruel towards the young aspirants to the priesthood and a positive injury to the best interests of the Church to keep our young men back systematically by prescribing an unnecessary and unwarranted length of preparatory courses. The Church requires the completion of the 24th year for the priesthood. For special reasons she even grants a dispensation from her law. We must not try to be wiser and stricter than the Church herself. There are men in the assembly who had hardly completed the 23rd year, when they were ordained, their course of studies had been much curtailed; do they perhaps look upon this as a real calamity to them? Was it not rather a blessing?

Suppose a young man begins his studies after the 8th grade. He is about 14 years old. If we add 6 years for the Preparatory Seminary, one year novitiate, three years philosophy, 5 years theology, we have him 29 years old when he shall have finished his course—five years more than the Church requires. Is that not too much? And these five years are withdrawn from his priestly activity, years of youth, energy, zeal and buoyancy. Who will dare to answer for that? Hence, with due regard for the necessity of training learned and efficient priests, we must not introduce a system which will be cruel to our young men and detrimental to the Church of God.

FR. URBAN:—The reform of the “classical curriculum” must begin with the question of Entrance Requirements. What should we ask of a boy before admitting him to the Preparatory Seminary? Doubtless, we all

Entrance Requirements. agree that he should possess a good elementary education. But what constitutes an elementary education? What is its scope and definition? We are familiar with the present, inconsistent, and congested plan of studies in the elementary schools. It's a system that is illogically arranged. In the seventh and eighth grades, in particular, there are topics, and methods of teaching that have no business in an elementary course. Why for instance teach in a course of elementary arithmetic all about taxes, stocks, bonds and custom? To what purpose the many points of international commerce

in the study of Geography? Again, should subjects like Science, Algebra and Geometry, Civics, Shorthand and Bookkeeping be taught in a course that is called elementary? It is evident that our present system of elementary education demands reorganization and differentiation between elementary and secondary instruction. But that is not our department. Our purpose is to determine when the boy is fit to enter the preparatory Seminary. Should he tarry in the school until he has completed the seventh and eighth grades with their mimic courses of secondary education? My contention is that the boy should complete his elementary education in six years. In advocating this, I do not mean that the present eight grades of the elementary school should be done in six years, and then terminate. The contention is that the first six years should be devoted to purely elementary work; that during these six years the pupils should be instructed with much thoroughness especially in Religion, Reading, Writing and Arithmetic; and that the courses which follow, whether the boy remains in the same school or goes over to high-school, should be designated as secondary instruction. Assuming then, such a differentiation of courses after the sixth grade, what can we expect of a boy at the end of such a course? I would say with Father Howard, that he should know his Catechism and Bible History; he should be able to spell correctly and to write a good, legible hand; he should read with intelligence and know the fundamental operations of arithmetic, fractions and percentage; he should be able to write a short letter in good plain English and should be a boy of good moral conduct. That's all. A boy who answers this description has received a good elementary education and is fit, if otherwise there are signs of a priestly calling, to enter the preparatory seminary. The fact that he has not "finished the grades" should be no impediment. This six years' plan is followed extensively not only in the schools of Europe, but is also in process of adoption in the schools of this country. Quite a number of large cities now have their classical high-schools following the sixth year of elementary work. The plan has been repeatedly discussed and advocated in the meetings of both the Catholic and National Educational Associations. Only recently the Conference of Catholic Colleges of Ohio expressed itself in favor of the plan. In my opinion, this Conference should also give an expression to the effect that, with regard to the admission of students to our preparatory seminaries, we should no longer be obliged to conform to the parochial system of eight grades, and that a six years' elementary course should be sufficient to meet our entrance requirements.

FR. PROVINCIAL:—My reasons for a six years' Classical Course in the Preparatory Seminary are:

1.) Our General Constitutions prescribe that the classical studies should be finished before the Novitiate; therefore, the one year "Humaniora"

Six Years' Classical Course. which in some Provinces is now taught after the Novitiate should be taken before the Novitiate, which would make the course last at least six years.

2.) A course of five years of classical studies seems to be too deficient and really too incomplete to give our students in the large, well-organized Provinces a thorough classical education.

3.) The experience of our Seraphic College clearly proves that it is very difficult to finish both the Latin and Greek Grammars, with the proper reading of Latin and Greek authors in Prose and Poetry, in five years.

4.) Allowing a six years' course, a part of the sixth year could be used to finish both Grammars well and to devote the rest of the sixth year to a thorough repetition of the entire Grammar.

5.) The boys who enter the Novitiate after the sixth year are generally better physically developed and, therefore, stronger and better fitted to stand the strenuous life of the Novitiate and the following years of hard studies. There is less fear or danger of a nervous breakdown.

6.) After the completion of the sixth year the students seem more confirmed in their holy vocation. We do not speak of exceptional cases, for even a young student may show a very positive vocation. But the general rule is that the older the student becomes, the more serious and settled he is. Such older students by showing a good example will also exercise a very good influence over the younger students.

7.) As our Provinces must generally train our students in two living languages, and as most of the students who enter our Colleges do not show that thorough elementary school-education which is a necessary foundation for the higher classical course, six years seem to be even more imperative in our country than in others, where they use only one living language.

8.) Even the best European Provinces have at least six years classical studies before they admit students to the Novitiate.

9.) The word "saltem" in No. 20 of the General Constitution seems to indicate that five years are considered the minimum; and the words "juxta programmata quibus in illa regione studia reguntur," point to six years for us, as the best Colleges in this country favor the six years' course.

FR. CLAUDE:—There are those who advocate a 6-years' college course for our students. In my estimation this is neither necessary, nor practical, nor advisable.

It is not necessary, since 5 years are sufficient for the average student to acquire a thorough classical foundation in Latin and Greek and the other branches taught in College. If you expect to make classical scholars out of our students, then even 6 years would not be enough. The college, however, is not expected to do more than prepare our students for

the higher courses in the seminary, and for that reason is called "ex officio" a Preparatory Seminary. Classical scholarship can only be acquired by a post-graduate course, open to a very few, but the curriculum of the Preparatory Seminary must conform itself to the needs of all students preparing for the Priesthood, not to a few only.

Nor would a 6-years' course be practical or advisable. This sixth year would have to be added at the beginning or the end of our present course. If placed at the beginning it would be nothing else than a seventh or eighth school-grade, and we would be forced to teach what our elementary schools can and do give in better form and better surroundings and with more success, than we could hope for in the college. Besides, neither the parents nor the school-teachers would be willing to send us the boys at that age. Parents will not let their boy go before the age of 12, on the plea, that he is too young to leave home and go among strangers, and too little developed to know his own mind. The teachers on the other hand want the children to finish the school, if for no other reason than to make a showing at graduation and demonstrate to the people that the school-course is not completed until the eighth grade. A general exodus of children after the 6th and 7th grade might result, if exceptions were made.

To add a 6th year at the end of the college course would be inadvisable from a different standpoint, namely, that of the Philosophy course. The course in Rational Philosophy should begin at the age when the sense-faculties and memory have reached their height of development, and the mind is ready for special training. A boy is considered a man when his mental power is fully developed, when his thinking faculty has become set. This is usually the age of 21. That does not mean that he cannot acquire any more knowledge after the age of 21, but only that his power of thought and manner of acquiring knowledge must be molded before that time, if we wish to obtain the best results. When the body stops growing the spiritual faculties still continue to grow, but only along those lines and grooves and habits that have been already formed. The raw material of our cognitive faculty began to be gathered with the first dawn of reason. All through the school and college courses we added to that store of material, separating the foreign matter and filling in the crevices with good and useful knowledge, hammering and shaping and melting it, as best we could, to make it fit the mold. But the final cast is made in the study of Philosophy. There the mind is to receive its final shape and form that it may fully serve its future purpose. What the mind acquires after that stage is not a different form, but only an addition of knowledge apperceived in terms of previous experience by the faculty already molded. It is the duty of Philosophy, however, to give this last touch in the development of our mental faculties, to teach us the nature of our intellect (Psychology), and how to use it according to the rules of thought (Logic), on what ultimate principles all our knowledge rests (Meta-

physics), what man's final aim in life should be and our rights and duties in this regard (Ethics), etc. Thus Philosophy should be taught as the final complement of the formation of the mind, and the course in Philosophy should be completed ordinarily with the completion of the 21st year.

My experience in teaching the last year of the Philosophy course is, that those who have passed the 21st year are handicapped in proportion to their age, and that the younger ones find it easier to grasp the intricacies of argument, explanation, etc., than the older ones. That means that, as a rule, the clerics should study Philosophy during the years 18 to 21. If, however, they are to begin the study of Philosophy with the 18th year, and they can hardly enter college before the 12th year, if indeed we can get them that early, it follows logically and psychologically, that ordinarily only five years should be devoted to the college course. When in an individual case a 6th year is necessary, it is either lack of talent, or deficiency of preparation, and these are exceptions which do not warrant us to make a change in the rule.

FR. GEORGE:—From what has been said in favor of a five years' course of classical studies, it seems, that the main objection against a six years' course is the fact, that our students would reach a too far advanced age by the time they finish their general education. Since they must have finished the eighth grade of the grammar school before they can begin their classical studies, they would enter the seminary at the age of fourteen. Add to this six years of classical studies, one year in the Novitiate, three years of philosophical studies and you have twenty-four years, a rather advanced age for beginning theology. In answer to this objection I beg to remark, that it is undoubtedly true, that such an age is too far advanced. The study of Philosophy and Theology should be taken up sooner. How is this end to be obtained? By shortening the classical course? Emphatically, no. The mistake to be corrected is the excessively long period of time given to elementary work. Shorten that time by taking up classical studies after the completion of the sixth grade and then you will have gained two precious years.

I know well enough, that the requirements for admission into the public high schools demand eight years of elementary school-work. I am aware of the fact, that our Catholic institutions have been forced to accommodate to the entrance requirements of the secular schools. Yet, this state of affairs is a calamity. To put off the beginning of secondary school-work, especially the beginning of the classical studies to the age of fourteen is an educational blunder. Everywhere in Europe secondary education begins at an earlier age. And in this matter Europe is following the course pointed out by nature and approved by centuries of experience. It is the right thing to do. Happily, this defect has been recognized as such by American educators. Last week a paper was read

at one of the meetings of the College Department of the Catholic Educational Association strongly advocating the beginning of secondary education after finishing the sixth grade of the grammar school. Fr. Spalding, S. J., who read the paper, quoted a number of non-catholic educators in America who reject the present practice of putting off secondary education until after the eighth year of elementary work on the ground, that it is a pedagogical blunder. External circumstances, particularly state-laws, making eight years of school attendance compulsory, have forced the seventh and eighth grade upon the elementary school. The discussion following the reading of this paper seemed to show that the sentiment of the majority of the hearers was strongly in favor of the proposed reform. The junior high school movement, which is rapidly gaining ground in various parts of the country, whatever its defects, at least shows that the late beginning of secondary education is being more and more recognized as a mistake and an evil that ought to be done away with. In this instance again we have a vindication of the soundness, correctness and wisdom of the old practice followed by all Catholic schools prior to their forced submission to external influences.

In keeping with sound pedagogical principles and sane practice let our students begin their classical studies after having successfully finished the sixth grade or, at most, the seventh grade of the parochial school and then two years or at least one year will be gained for a six years' course of classical studies. Coming now to the direct answer of the question: Shall the course of classical studies of the Preparatory Seminary last five or six years, I unhesitatingly reply it should last six years. The higher and more lasting a building is intended to be the deeper and more solid must be the foundation upon which it rests. The classical course of studies is the foundation of all higher ecclesiastical studies. If we wish to give our students a thorough and solid ecclesiastical education we must begin with laying a deep and solid foundation. Hence we must see to it that our students get a thorough and solid classical course. This point deserves special attention. As far as my experience goes, I venture the opinion that in the deficiency of our classical studies is to be found the source of most of the miseria over which the lectors of Philosophy and Theology not unfrequently lament.

Particular cases excepted, the average American priest compares unfavorably with priests of some countries in Europe with regard to classical training and culture. Take, for instance, the knowledge of Latin. How does it come that so many priests do not care to take up any standard theological work in Latin? What accounts for the same tendency growing among students to prefer an English theological work to one written in the language of the great masters of theology? Why must even the rubrics in the liturgical books be translated into the vernacular? Why do we find so many who do not dare to take up the *Codex Juris Canonici* and read and study the text but have recourse to second hand transla-

tions, summaries and similar productions? The same holds good with regard to the Encyclicals and official documents of the Apostolic See. The lack of knowledge and training in the classical languages makes itself painfully felt, and hence the reading of Latin becomes a task and burden to which their attainments prove unequal. Hence, the necessity of seizing some kind of crutches in order to support their weak and tottering intellectual frame. Such a condition is indeed an unenviable "testimonium paupertatis." What is sorely needed is the strengthening of the foundation of clerical culture, the deepening and strengthening of the classical studies.

For a thorough, deep and solid course of classical training, sufficient time must be at the disposal of the student. A rushing through some subject-matter will not give more than a mere superficial smattering of the classical languages. Continued, patient and persevering drill and practice—drudgery if you will—is indispensable if a thorough and solid classical training is to be attained.

I know full well, that the duration of the course alone will not guarantee success; method and manner are just as important factors as time is in bringing about happy results. Yet, *ceteris paribus*, a longer time of drill, exercise and practice will under normal conditions make for better results. Accordingly, I venture the opinion that a six years' course is by far preferable to a five years' course of classical studies.

If we consult the history of Catholic education, we find that since the revival of the classical studies in the time of the Humanists the course of classical studies under normal conditions always lasted six years. This period of time became a fixed tradition in the classical schools of the Church. The same practice was also adopted by the classical schools conducted by Protestants. When the *Ratio Studiorum* of the Society of Jesus sets down six years as the normal duration of the classical course, it embodies in this enactment nothing else but what has been the general practice of the schools and has been tried and tested and found to be sound and satisfactory.

Though the classical schools of Europe have gone through a process of modification and, to some extent, of transformation, especially during the eighteenth and the nineteenth century, yet the duration of the classical course has not been shortened.

If we examine the programs of studies followed in the classical schools of Europe today, we find that in all the leading countries at least six years are prescribed for the study of the classics. Italy is an exception. But the five years' course in the Italian schools finds an explanation in the fact that, owing to the great similarity between Latin and Italian, the elements of Latin can be more quickly mastered by the students. Yet it remains to be proved, whether a six years' course would not be an improvement even for these students.

Dr. Willman, an acknowledged authority in educational matters and one of the foremost representatives of Catholic education in Europe,

speaks of the organization of the schools of higher education in his excellent work "Didaktik als Bildungslehre" (vol. II, p. 493). The institutions giving a general liberal education in preparation for professional studies should according to Dr. Willmann, comprise two departments. In the lower department, comprising six or seven years, the classical studies should be pursued, in the higher department, comprising two or three years, the study of Philosophy and the Natural Sciences should be the chief work. He even suggests that the lower department receive the good old name of Latin School, and the higher, that of Lyceum.

If the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore directs "in omnibus puerorum seminariis quae etiam Parva vel Praeparatoria vocantur, studiorum cursus non pauciores quam sex annos complectatur" (Conc. Plen. Balt. III. Acta et Decr. Tit. V. C. 1, No. 145) it is but reproducing an old and well approved tradition of clerical education.

These legislative enactments are not the outcome of expressive enthusiasm for classical studies, but are based on sober facts and the wise experience of centuries.

Another circumstance is worthy of our attention. In former times the number of branches taught in the classical schools was smaller than it is now. If in former times a six years' course was deemed necessary for a good and solid classical training, can we hope to reach the same goal in a shorter period of time, when for better or for worse, branches of study have been added to the curriculum?

Hence, I firmly believe that the course of our classical studies should last six years, in order to give our students a solid foundation upon which the structure of their future learning and culture can rest secure.

FR. URBAN:—In discussing the question of a five or six years' classical course, we must take into consideration both the old schedule of studies and the new. It seems to me that the advocates of a six years' classical course are debating the question on the basis of the old schedule. They argue that, with our arrangement of studies in the past, we were not able to impart a thorough classical training in less than six years. However, we are now engaged in reforming the curriculum and in making it more extensive, not in years, but in the number of daily and weekly periods. According to the new schedule we shall have 32 weekly periods, whereas formerly we had only 26. Latin, Greek, English, Mathematics, and Science, each of these branches receive, in the adoption of the new plan, an additional number of hours. Let us remember that we are thus adding to the old schedule at least 230 periods per year. Why then, if there is no practical necessity, add another year, and make the course unduly long? I may add that, if under the old plan of curriculum we were able to produce results that were, in general, satisfactory, how much better will these results be under the new plan, with its additional class hours. We must also bear in mind that the study of Latin and other

classical subjects does not cease with the termination of the College course. They are continued in the novitiate; and the new plan of curriculum for Philosophy again provides for the study of Latin, Greek, Elocution, and Science. For these reasons I am opposed to the six years' classical course. If, however, the six years' elementary course is generally adopted, which means that we shall get the boys at the age of eleven or twelve, I consider it advisable to extend the classical course to six years.

FR. FERDINAND:—I should like to go on record as strongly favoring a six years' course for the preparatory seminary. My reasons are briefly as follows. Our General Constitutions say: *Studia gymnasialia in Collegio Seraphico tradenda in quinque saltem scholares annos distribuantur.* Now, the question is, are we willing to admit that a five-year course is sufficient for our needs? I, for one, am not prepared to say that a classical course of five years is a sufficient equipment for our students; because our curriculum is so congested that I can not see how it is possible for the teachers to treat the various subjects and for the pupils to assimilate them with any degree of thoroughness in less than six years.

It is comforting to know that I do not stand alone in my contention. For, there seems to be a consensus of opinion among the members on this point. Even the advocates of a five-year course are at pains to prove that this course must be extended beyond the Novitiate, even into the years of Philosophy and Theology. Their position seems to me utterly untenable. Either five years of classical studies are a sufficient preparation for the higher studies and for life, or not. If so, then to teach the classical branches during and after the Novitiate is an unpardonable waste of time. If, on the other hand, five years are insufficient, then by all means let us provide a course of six or seven years, to be completed, however, as the General Constitutions prescribe, in the preparatory seminary. The opponents of the six years' course find themselves in the strange position of admitting, at least tacitly, that the shorter course is insufficient and of refusing to adopt the longer.

Nor will it do for them to take refuge behind No. 20 of the General Constitutions, which says: *Ab unaquaque Provincia, juxta programmata quibus in respectiva regione studia illa reguntur, apte ordinentur, ita quidem ut finis specialis horum studiorum pro Ordine nostro quo melius fieri possit attingatur.* The obvious interpretation of this provision is, that we may, and perhaps should, conform to the requirements of the schools in a certain territory, when this conformity is to our advantage. But surely the meaning can not be, that we are required to adopt their systems in every particular even if such a procedure would operate to our disadvantage.

The fact that, in the opinion of some, boys are incapable of profiting as they should by the subjects treated in the sixth year, is no excuse for

depriving them of all the opportunity of profiting. The boys of the lower classes are still less capable of deriving all the advantages possible from their instructions. But I can see no reason why it should be so utterly impossible for the boys to benefit by studies which everywhere are regarded as college subjects and as such taught to boys of the same age as those of the sixth year ordinarily are.

With us a six years' course has been in operation for almost twenty-five years, and it has proved eminently practical. I have yet to hear a single adverse criticism of the plan from anyone acquainted with it, and its modus operandi. Far from being willing to shorten the classical course, the authorities of the Province have consistently advocated a year of Humanities after the Novitiate. These studies will be dropped, however, as soon as the third year of Philosophy is introduced. Under no consideration, however, would they be willing to sacrifice another year of classical studies.

There is a tendency among Catholic educators to admit boys into the preparatory seminary after the sixth year of the elementary school. We have gone on record as favoring this movement. Now, as soon as it becomes the rule to admit the boys at the age of twelve, it will be, not merely desirable, but necessary to hold the boys for six years in the preparatory seminary; because they will be too young to enter the Novitiate after the fifth year.

Besides all this, it may be well to recall that the six years' preparatory course is prescribed by the Ratio Studiorum of the Jesuits, and that it is in operation in the majority of the best Catholic schools in the country. I think it would be a sad day for Catholic higher education if these seminaries should be forced to shorten their course, owing to the pressure exerted on them by persons desirous of innovations.

FR. ERMIN:—Whether the Preparatory Seminary Course should extend over five years or six years, appears to be decidedly an open question—among ourselves as well as among the other secular and religious seminaries of our country.

In the Seminary Department of the Catholic Educational Convention, the other day, one Rev. Rector reported that in the course of his special extensive inquiry on this subject, he found these facts: 1) Among the foremost seminaries of our country, some have a five-year preparatory course, while others have a six-year course; the present margin in the comparison seems to favor five years. 2) Within the last few years several seminaries have changed from five to six years; several, from six to five. 3) This apparent uncertainty and experimenting seems to find its reason in the difficulty encountered with entrance requirements.

As to our Seraphic Seminaries, we find this same discrepancy in practice, and it is evidently beyond the scope and power of this Conference to settle the question definitely either for any single Province or for all

the Provinces as a unit. However, this consideration does not preclude the advisability of discussing and throwing further light upon the question.

If we were masters of the situation to such a degree that we regularly admitted boys at the age of twelve, on completion of the sixth grade, then, I am sure, the preparatory course in all our seminaries would comprise six years. However, taking conditions as they are and weighing the difficulties of entrance requirements carefully, I am not prepared to admit either the necessity or the advisability of a six-year course; and I hold, on the contrary, that a five-year course even fits in better and should accomplish more satisfactorily the preparatory part of our complete curriculum.

In admitting a prospective student you at once ask his age. Age is, indeed, a very important consideration in every department of study. Now, take the case of the average student today: he is 14 years old when he enters the Preparatory Seminary; add five years for this course, and he is 19 when he enters the novitiate; 20, when he makes profession and begins the study of Philosophy; 23, when he takes solemn vows and begins Theology; 27, when he is ordained and begins to form his priestly habits. Is there any period in this career, where the cleric would be at an advantage if he were a year older? I think not. The laws of the Church seem to imply that she expects to find him at each of these goals even several years sooner.

In meeting the argument that we can not cover satisfactorily all the subject-matter of the preparatory curriculum in less than six years, I think we can reduce the objection to this simple statement: "You can not teach enough Latin in five years." And with this statement I can not agree. What is our aim? To give a thorough classical course, to be sure, as the term goes. In five years our students become acquainted with Caesar, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, and other authors if you will. But five years will not suffice to make real Latin scholars. Nor will six years suffice. More than half of your students will never become scholars in this sense; and they need not. Your "scholar" is not made in the classroom; but in less than five years you can inspire the responsive student with an appreciation and an enthusiasm that will prompt him to make a "scholar" of himself.

Our Latin course accomplishes its main purpose, if the student is thereby adequately prepared for his succeeding studies in Philosophy and Theology. Whether his classical course has lasted five years or six years, he will encounter difficulties when first he meets the Breviary; Scriptural and Patristic Latin is new to him: he will stumble when first he opens his text-book of Philosophy; it is the same experience he had when he took up his first Science book, though that was English: he will often consult the dictionary with "Sabetti" open before him; he is still learning Latin: he may recite his Theological lesson in ungrammatical Latin; cor-

rect him; let us remember, he is going to preach this Theology in English; of course, he woefully lacks that pleasing fluency of Latin speech which his professor acquired during a post-graduate course in the Eternal City. Need we wonder at all this? Can all these defects, or any of them, be remedied by an additional year in the preparatory curriculum?

You can not attempt to "finish" the Latin course in five or six years; and, let me add, the same truth holds good of English. Assuredly, the course in English is a point to be considered in discussing the length of the curriculum. If there is one reason why our priests should be Latin scholars, there are ten reasons why they should be English scholars. I will not digress by enlarging upon this statement here, but I believe it very pertinent to point out a few facts bearing on the student's course in English.

In the Preparatory Seminary the student reviews what he has studied in the grades; his mature mind grasps with better intelligence the etymology and syntax of the language. He takes up the study of Composition; he reads a few good authors, and is told to imitate their style; he learns to write an interesting narrative; he succeeds in drawing a vivid picture in words; he attempts the third form of discourse, exposition—and very consciously fails; he appreciates reading a good argument, but writing a forceful argumentative treatise is beyond his abilities. He has arrived at a point in his English course, where logic requires that he study Logic, or rather Philosophy. A student can learn to use words and fling phrases, but he can not complete his course in Rhetoric before he takes up Philosophy.

Furthermore, a course in English includes essentially the study of English Literature. What does the Preparatory Seminary accomplish here? The student becomes familiar with a few authors, whose style is easy to appreciate; he *can* memorize an endless number of biographies with names and dates from a "Handbook of Literature." But who will call that a course in Literature? Who will contend that a real appreciative course in English Literature is possible in the Preparatory Seminary? Incidentally I may remark that several seminaries of the best standing in this country include a course of English Literature with Philosophy.

Now, my contention is this: The course in English, which we absolutely must give our students, can not be completed in the Preparatory Seminary—neither in five nor in six years. Even before he completes his fifth year the student has arrived at a pass where, from the standpoint of his English course, he should begin the study of Philosophy. He has also covered sufficiently the so-called minor branches of study, and has even dabbled in some of the Sciences that are beyond his thorough appreciation. But for the sake of making him a better Latin scholar, you would hold him another year in the Preparatory Seminary. Is this advisable? I hold to the contrary.

Let us view our Seminary curriculum in its entirety. A complete course of thirteen years surely can not be called abbreviated. With three years in Philosophy our students should have a collegiate training second to none. The year of novitiate can not perhaps be called a year of study, but it is decidedly a year of education; it is part of our curriculum. Even during the vacation terms the education of our clerics goes on. Education is the word. We aim to educate our young men so that they may be truly efficient in the ministry. Can we accomplish this in thirteen years; or do we require fourteen? Secular seminaries, with their long, distracting vacations interrupting to the last, profess to succeed with twelve years and less. I think this discrepancy in itself invites to second thought.

Now, speaking for our Seraphic Seminary in Cincinnati, I would point out that for the past 35 years we have had a preparatory course of five years. I do not know that the efficiency of this course has ever been questioned. Indeed, in those seminaries that have chanced to enroll any of our graduates, we enjoy an enviable reputation. Our five-year course is entirely in harmony with the ruling of the General Constitution of our Order. We do not stand alone in our position among the Franciscan seminaries of our country; and when I recall the names of certain other seminaries with their five-year course, I feel that we are in very good company. Therefore, I simply ask, "Why should we change now?"

I am not asking this Conference to go on record as endorsing the five-year preparatory course, but I do protest against endorsing the six-year course under present conditions.

FR. HUGH:—The course of classical studies in the Preparatory Seminary should depend on the age of the student and his natural talents. The ordinary course ought not be longer than five years, possibly four, if the boy has finished his regular 8th grade. I believe the course ought to be elastic and due allowance should be made for students of advanced age and exceptional abilities. A boy of maturer age will grasp things more quickly, although his memory work and recitation might not be so brilliant. In the case of very talented boys, it seems there is danger that their enthusiasm will be dulled, if they keep pace only with the ordinary routine of class work. It is easily possible that they may become sluggish, flighty in mind and superficial and hurried in their work. Hence, they should either find some special occupation and be engaged in special study, or their course should be shortened, if found advisable. Of course, this conflicts with system; but system should not be followed slavishly; due allowance ought to be made for extraordinary cases. I heartily endorse the method of taking boys after the 6th grade in our Preparatory Seminaries, wherever this can be prudently done. For these I advocate an ordinary six years' course, with the provision that very bright boys ought to be enabled to finish in five years, for the reasons I have stated before.

FR. PETER:—Five years at the Seraphic Seminary seems to be sufficient to prepare an aspirant for the study of Philosophy, provided he has applied himself to his studies during this time.

This will be true all the more after the new study plan, discussed at this Conference, has been adopted. I sincerely hope it will be considered favorably by the Very Rev. Provincials at their next annual meeting.

This five years' course presupposes, however, that three years should be allowed for Philosophy, during which classical studies are again pursued, as suggested by the Conference.

Should the Provincial Superiors not approve of the plan of a three years' course in Philosophy, then I would advocate a six years' course at our preparatory seminaries.

FR. LOUIS:—With regard to the classical course of our Preparatory Seminaries. I am of the opinion that, with our present requirements for entrance, a course of 5 years seems to be abundantly sufficient. However, as it becomes a general rule to receive boys from the sixth grade, I think a six-year course will be absolutely necessary to prepare the students for philosophy.

FR. URBAN:—The reform of the curriculum is important, but the essential, the vital element in education is the ability of the teacher. Unless we adopt the Department System, and give our prospective **Specialization.** teachers opportunities of specialization we shall never obtain real scholarly results. This special preparation is necessary for the teachers of every department, classical, philosophical, and theological. Let us adopt it without delay.

THE CURRICULUM OF PHILOSOPHY.

REV. CLAUDE MINDORFF, O. F. M.,
Lector of Philosophy, St. Francis Monastery, Cincinnati, O.

1. Plan of a Three-year Course. II. Practical Suggestions.

The subject referred to me for this morning's discussion is as wide and general as the subject of Philosophy itself. I have endeavored to boil it down, however, to nine questions, the first five leading to a plan of a three-year course in Philosophy, and the other four offering some practical suggestions for the execution of that plan. Presupposing that you have read some of the references appended to the list of questions, and hoping that the subsequent discussion will bring out the obscurer points better than any essay could do, I shall be as brief as possible.

1. *Question:*—*Shall we adopt a three-year course of Philosophy and include the Natural Sciences in that course? And which Natural Sciences shall be thus included?*

That a course of three years is necessary, seems to be the prevalent opinion among writers and teachers of Philosophy. It is necessary, 1.) on account of the study of Philosophy itself. Philosophy is certainly a very interesting study, and, if properly handled by the teacher, cannot fail to enlist from the student that whole-hearted interest and application, which it needs and deserves. But even the best can become tedious and irksome and disinteresting,—if overdone. The youthful mind is not steady enough to devote its whole energy to one branch of study, day after day, without beginning to relax in its efforts. The best piece of music, if drawn out, becomes tiresome; the best sermon must not be too long; and the richest food, if dished up too frequently, loses its flavor. One philosophy-class a day is for the same reason plenty and enough for the average student. We must give it time to digest. To take it more frequently and without other condiment, is to cause mental nausea and indigestion. But a two-year course obliges us to devote nearly the whole time to

Philosophy, or at least two classes on two or more days of the week. Ergo.

2. A second reason is the necessity of the Natural Sciences for a solid course in Philosophy. The Natural Sciences are both a preparation and a necessary complement to Philosophy, and should therefore precede and accompany that study. The concrete objects and facts of nature are the starting-point of our abstract ideas and serve as a basis for the principles and universal laws of Philosophy,—not in the sense that self-evident and metaphysical principles must first be demonstrated by the facts of Physics,—but in the sense, that our mind must form its ideas from the objects of sense-perception, and by studying the laws of nature be led to the fulll realization of metaphysical principles. The Natural Sciences, however, not only lead to the ideas and principles of Philosophy, but serve also as illustrations and factors of interest in the study itself, and make it more practical and appetizing. They are both appetizer and condiment to the philosophical food, and should therefore both precede and accompany that study.

It is true, we study Natural Sciences in the College or Preparatory Seminary, but that is not enough, nor to the point. The ordinary college-student is not sufficiently developed to grasp the importance of the Natural Sciences, or their relation to his future studies; nor do his other studies leave him time enough to get full value out of them; nor would the time devoted in college to a complete study of the sciences be justified by the result hitherto achieved. As a rule they are studied only by a select few, who take interest in one or the other branch, but the majority consider them unimportant, and not worth the trouble. The stress, which is justly laid on the languages and other studies, seems to sustain such erroneous views. I admit that the Natural Sciences should also be studied in the Preparatory Seminary, but, as I will prove later, merely from a beginner's standpoint; the fundamental and complete course in Natural Sciences should be reserved for the philosophical course.

At the same time Philosophy will determine which of the Natural Sciences are necessary for this course:

Cosmology demands a study of Chemistry and Physics. In Chemistry I would include the fundamental knowledge of Geology and Mineralogy, adding a limited number of lectures on Astronomy. The full course of Physics, however, can be given at College.

Psychology is based upon the biological studies of Botany, Zoology, Physiology, and Empirical Psychology. The first three could be treated under the one title of Biology, or as successive sciences; the last, viz. Empirical Psychology, is merely the first part of Psychology from an empirical standpoint, and can form a part of the Philosophy course proper.

Ethics should be accompanied by Sociology, and Logic by a thorough course in Rhetoric. These two branches, though not classed as natural sciences, are nevertheless mentioned here because of their connection with Philosophy. Moreover, Rhetoric has an importance all its own for the ecclesiastical student and should be retained in all three years of the philosophical course.

2. Question:—In what order should the different branches be arranged? Should we follow the old order (called Synthetic), or the new one (=Analytic)?

There are two orders possible in the arrangement of branches: the present order, which its adherents call the Logical or Synthetic Order, and a more modern one, championed by Mercier and the Neo-Scholastics, which professes to be both logical and psychological, and may aptly be styled the Analytic Order. The first arranges the branches as follows: 1. Logic, the Science of Thought; 2. Metaphysics, the Science of Real Things subdivided into General and Special Metaphysics, including Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, and Theodicy; 3. and lastly, Ethics, the Science of Right and Duty.

The Analytic Order may be seen in Mercier's Manual of Modern Scholastic Philosophy. He arranges the branches as follows: 1. Introduction to Philosophy; 2. Cosmology and Psychology, treating of created beings; 3. Criteriology, of our knowledge of them; 4. Ontology, of general being; 5. Theodicy, of the Efficient Cause of all being; 6. Logic, of the Acts of the Mind;

7. Ethics of the Acts of the Will; 8. History and Summary of Philosophy.

What is to be thought of these two methods? In answering this question there are three points to be considered: 1. the logical sequence of matter; 2. the psychological order of apprehension of such matter; and 3. other practical considerations.

1. *Logically*, either order might be followed, if due consideration is given to the sequence of thought. The main difficulty arises from the dovetailing of the different branches into one another and their mutual relation and dependence. This difficulty can be obviated only by arranging the matter in such a way, that the thoughts follow one another, without taking into consideration, whether they refer to an object of a different branch or not, and we should not hesitate to repeat any subject or treatise, if the sequence of thought requires such repetition. In fact, I think the best system would be one in which the different branches were not separated or fenced off, like so many pastures, but rather one in which all would be interwoven and correlated like one grand piece of landscape, with valleys and hills, rivers and lakes, woods and open pastures, all united to form one beautiful scenery. Such scenery could be viewed first as a whole, then in its separate parts without losing sight of the main road or the rest of the scenery, and then summarized again at the end as a means of impressing it more deeply on the memory. Whilst paying attention to one part, however, we should not forget to cast our eyes upon the surrounding parts within our range of vision.

2. *Considered psychologically*, i. e. in the order of apprehension, the Analytic Order is surely to be preferred. The Synthetic Order, followed by the present textbooks, is, I think, an unnatural method. It begins with the most abstruse and theoretical of all Sciences, that of Logic, and ends with the easiest and most practical branch, Ethics. It treats first of the *Entia Rationis*, of ideas in their formal meaning, having no real representation in the order of nature. Then in Ontology it passes over to the real order of things, but begins again with the most abstract and difficult to grasp, the *Ens* with its transcendental qualities. And only

after the student has become thoroughly disheartened, and imbued with the idea that Philosophy is the most unpractical of sciences, does it let him down from the dizzy heights and rarified atmosphere of abstraction,—down to the concrete and individual objects where ideas have a visible representative, which the fancy can keep before the mind, whilst the latter is in operation. Lastly it treats the easiest and most interesting of all natural sciences, Theodicy and Ethics, telling him there, what he has heard numberless times in Christian Doctrine in the elementary schools.

This method of philosophical textbooks is therefore little adapted to our manner of apprehension. Psychology teaches that we first perceive the individual and concrete objects before we ascend to abstract and universal ideas; and likewise, that the more abstract the object, the more difficult the science. For that reason the objects of sense-perception should be studied first, in other words, Cosmology and Psychology should take first place among the branches of Philosophy. Ontology and Logic for the same reason, since they have for their objects the *Ens* in its most general and abstract forms, should be treated later. Ethics must be treated after Psychology and Theodicy, since it is the logical consequence of these branches. Psychologically considered, therefore the Analytic Order is the one to be preferred.

But somebody might object, that we must first learn to use our tools before beginning to work,—therefore study Logic and Criteriology first to know all about the operations of the Intellect, then use this knowledge in the acquirement of ideas, beginning with the simplest form of the *Ens Methaphysicum*, and ending with the more complex. This sounds very well, indeed, but does not go deep enough. You cannot learn how to swim on dry land, nor can you learn to think without material for thought. Besides, if it be so impossible to use your intellect before studying Logic, pray, with what faculty do you intend to study Logic itself!? NO! the quickest and most logical way to learn the use of a tool is to go to work and use it on some easy material first, and later, on the more difficult and artistic. Only after you are able to use the tool, will you be able to study it intelligently, and improve on it.

3. *From a practical view-point*, however, considering the present form of textbooks, and the lack of good reference works arranged according to the new system, I would prefer to go slowly in the adoption of the new order. I've always followed the principle of Hank Hawkins: "Never take off a dirty shirt, until you have a clean one to put on." No matter how soiled it may be, it is always better than none at all. Never discard an old system, until you have something better to install in its place. Our students need textbooks and works of reference, and until you have them in the new order, do not think of introducing it.

Cardinal Mercier and his colleagues at Louvain have begun the new system, and have arranged a short French textbook accordingly; this has now appeared in English translation, but in two unwieldy volumes. Possibly they can be rebound into a three-year division, but I hardly think so. In the manner of treating the various subjects the paragraphing seems to me at first sight to be short, simply and correctly arranged. The different branches appear complete, and the matter clear-cut and quite intelligible, though many things are missing, which I would consider important or at least appropriate. In Ethics, particularly, I believe a few treatises have been omitted, which are usually found in other textbooks. Whether he intends these omissions to be inserted in Sociology, or in Moral Theology, or will add them in a later edition, I cannot say. But I can say, that for various reasons I would not think of introducing it as a textbook in its present form.

Before general introduction of any new text, I think the various lectors ought to submit it to a thorough investigation, and then try it out with one or more courses, and make out a written report of their estimate of the same. If all agree, and the Superiors permit it, than we can make the change. Until then let us continue to use our old textbooks, dividing them into a three-year course, instead of two years, and adding the natural sciences where they best fit into the philosophical plan. So much for the second question.

3. Question:—How much of the Natural Sciences should be taught, and from what viewpoint should they be treated both in College and in the Course of Philosophy?

The answer to this question may be very brief. The study of the Natural Sciences belongs as well in a classical course as in a course of Philosophy. The viewpoint, however, should be different.

In College greater stress should be laid on the development of the senses and the memory of the student. The animals, plants, etc. should be treated as objects of sense-perception, using principally narration and description to illustrate their forms, habits, and activities, without going into any deeper study of their nature. In the Philosophical course of Natural Sciences stress should be laid on the intellectual cognition. The same objects should be treated, but from a general point of view, using principally comparison and argumentation to explain their classification into genera and species, and their fundamental activities of growth, nutrition, reproduction, sensitive faculties, etc. as a preliminary to determine their nature and place in the general scheme of the Universe. In other words, the College course should be a beginners' course, the Philosophical, an advanced course; the first should treat the manifestations of activities, the second the proximate causes that underlie those activities. Thus the way will be prepared for the further exploration in Philosophy of the ultimate causes of physical things.

4. Question:—Which other branches should be included in the Course of Philosophy?

After thoroughly discussing this question in the special meeting of the Philosophical Department, and after consulting individual members of the Theological Department, I find, there is very little divergence of opinion. The following additions to the course of Philosophy are advocated:—

In the first year, Patristic Latin and New Testament Greek; Hebrew in the second and third years;

The four modern languages of German, Italian, Spanish, and

French, where possible, giving preference to the one used the most in that particular province;

Rhetoric and Chant in all three years.

There is no need to emphasize or prove the necessity of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. The suggestion of so many modern languages may be objectionable on the score that it is a waste of valuable time, and would overcrowd the course. There is no doubt, that languages play a more important part in Europe, than they do here in America, but still it seems to me, that the facility in reading and translating the four above-mentioned languages will prove a great help in study and scientific research, as well as in pastoral work, when occasion demands. A reading knowledge, however, would be sufficient for the ordinary priest, and that would not take too much time. The particular language necessary to a bi-lingual province could be taught in all three years, one hour a week; the other three in one year. Ecclesiastical History and Introduction to Sacred Scripture belong to the Theological course. If on account of the professor, Hebrew must be taught in the Theological course, then either Church History or Introduction to Sacred Scripture may be anticipated in the course of Philosophy, in order not to overburden our theologians.

The importance of Rhetoric and Elocution and Chant cannot be accentuated enough. We need good speakers, good readers, good writers, good singers, and the people have a right to expect it of us. A good speaker is always welcome, and can do a lot of good. The same can be said of the others in proportion. In order that a student learn to use his voice properly and express his thoughts correctly, he should be continually trained in writing, speaking, reading, and singing. Correct intonation, articulation, modulation, use of gesture, language, composition, etc., are all more or less essential to priestly influence and power. These can only be acquired, however, after long and *continuous* study and practice in both the preparatory and the higher seminaries. These points have been already touched upon in the first paper and the subsequent discussion, and the members of this Conference seem to agree perfectly in the matter.

5. *Question:*—Give plan for three-year course, indicating the number of class-hours to be devoted to each branch.

In accordance with the foregoing remarks the following plan appears to be quite serviceable:—

First year:—

- 6=Logic and Ontology.
- 4=Natural Sciences (Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy).
- 2=Latin and Greek.
- 1=German (or other modern language needed).
- 2=Rhetoric and Reading Circle.
- 1=Chant.

16 hours.

Second year:—

- 6=Cosmology and Psychology.
- 4=Natural Sciences (Biology and Psychology).
- 2=Hebrew.
- 1=German.
- 2=Rhetoric and Reading Circle.
- 1=Chant.

16 hours.

Third year:—

- 6=Theodicy and Ethics.
- 3=History of Philosophy and Sociology.
- 2=Hebrew.
- 1=German.
- 1=French, Italian, and Spanish Reading.
- 2=Rhetoric and Reading Circle.
- 1=Chant.

16 hours.

In those provinces, in which English is the only language spoken, the extra hour of the first two years may be given to the sciences, and in the third year both language hours should be equally divided among the four modern languages mentioned.

Where Reading Circle is not considered as a class-hour, this hour may be used for repetition or Seminar.

6. Question:—Which textbooks and reference books would best serve our purpose?

The answer to this question, given by one of limited experience, must certainly be deficient. The textbooks for the various branches should be chosen by those, who have experience in the teaching of these branches. Besides, the discussion of this subject would hardly be interesting to the other two departments. I propose, therefore, to mention a few requirements of textbooks and reference books in general, and leave the specification of them to the afternoon sessions.

A textbook in my estimation should be short, but clear and concise, avoiding long illustrations and explanations, and giving only the essentials, but in such a way, that the logical connection of the different theses and the structure of arguments of each is quickly apparent, so that the book can serve both for memory work in preparation for the class-hour, and as a guide for reference work to further reading. The paragraphing should be short, and the titles of paragraphs as well as the main idea or *medius terminus* of an argument should be printed in bolder type. This facilitates the understanding of the text and an intelligent review of the same, by centering the attention on the main points to be remembered and on their logical connection. Whether the text of Philosophy should be in Latin or English, will be discussed in a later question.

For each textbook there should be a good reference book in the vernacular, full of illustrations and explanations, with plenty of foot-notes, and references to other authors and other opinions, containing not only the essentials, but also other questions of interest referring to the same subject. It should be arranged, as much as possible, on the same order as the textbook with the same titling and the same general contents, but in a different style, giving the matter in a form, which the teacher might use in explaining it to his pupils in the classroom.

Besides this general reference book there should be others treating of special subjects relating to the class-matter, but independently of the textbook. For example,—Langstroth's book on the Bees, or Wasman's on the Ants, or Animal Instinct, another

on the use of the Microscope, on Electricity, others on Hypnotism, Spiritualism, Socialism, etc., or similar books, should be on the shelves of the clerics' library. The object of these is to stimulate interest and encourage individual study and research. The mind of the student must gradually be broadened and made independent, so that when once left to himself, he will still have enough enthusiasm and good sense to take interest in current scientific topics, and choose his reading to his own profit and advancement. Only thus will the class-work be a real preparation for later life.

7. Question:—*How many teachers and what class-equipment would be required?*

As to teachers:—If the three courses of clerics are separated, living in different monasteries, we would on account of the number of hours and the variety of branches, and also for the sake of emulation among professors and pupils, require if possible two professors for each course, the Master being a lector for the minor branches. If the clerics are united in one seminary, then five, or, in an emergency, four might be sufficient. In that case there ought to be two for Philosophy, one for Natural Sciences, one for Rhetoric and Chant, one for Hebrew and Languages, or five in all, giving to each professor about ten hours a week. To oblige one professor to give 16 classes a week to the same class of pupils in such a variety of branches, would be asking too much, not only of the professor, who would be overburdened, but also of the pupils who need the *delectatio varietatis* both in their subject-matter and in their teachers.

As to class-equipment:—We need first of all good textbooks and a well-stocked library of reference-books. To procure these should be the special duty of each professor, and he ought to be allowed a certain latitude or independence from local superiors in the matter. The seminary is not local, but provincial, and it should make no difference whether the house is poor or not, as far as the seminary expenses are concerned. Let the province pay for it, and let the lectors be subject directly to their provincials in this respect.

In order to get the best in that line, I would suggest a certain amount of co-operation on the part of lectors and librarians, and I think this part of the question deserves more attention than is generally given to it. My suggestion is this:—Let each lector look through his library and catalog the best books for reference according to a certain formula, giving subject, title, publisher, size, and edition, with his estimate of its value as textbook or reference, and send his report to the Secretary of this Conference, who will classify and list the books according to subject and value, and after multiplying the list, send it to the lectors of the various provinces for their use. If the lectors disagree in their appreciation of a volume, let the secretary classify it thus, or omit it entirely from his list. Next let the librarians of the various houses look through their libraries for books, corresponding to the various subjects of the seminary, and if they can easily dispense with them, let them notify Fr. Provincial, and he can have them transferred accordingly; if, however, they do not wish to sacrifice them for the continual use of the seminarians, they could possibly loan them to the lectors for their perusal, who will buy them, if they are really necessary. By this means each seminary would gradually acquire a good library, which both as tool-house and ware-house is indispensable for lector and student.

The class-room itself should be roomy and airy with windows on one side only and desks should be arranged so that the light strikes the left of the pupils. Every class-room should have a black-board, and the lector should almost make it a point of conscience to use it every day. (You might reserve one little corner for mispronounced words). A small organ will also be necessary for the teaching of chant. The Natural Sciences will also need many different apparatus and materials, too numerous to mention here. Much of it, no doubt, would have to be bought, but many things could also be made or gathered by the professor, or by the students themselves. These paraphernalia would have to be preserved in separate cases, or in a separate room, if one is at hand, that might serve for a laboratory. Having all the clerics in one seminary would again help to cut down expenses in this regard.

Besides all this, there ought to be some current periodicals for each branch of study, both for the student and professor, to awaken interest and keep abreast of the times. When they read in some magazine an article on the very same subject, that has been treated in class, they will naturally consider it more important, and give it more attention. If the periodicals contain other irrelevant or useless matter such as fiction, etc., they can be censored by the professor, and certain articles picked out for binding and further use.

I might add that the most important equipment and one that outweighs all others in necessity, is a good teacher, a teacher who possesses knowledge, training, and the gift of communication, and who loves both his studies and his students. Sorry to say, such teachers are few and far between. The question of procuring good teachers and many other questions of similar importance could be discussed here, but since they are somewhat beyond the general subject of this essay, we can leave them to others for some future date.

8. Question:—Should Philosophy be taught in Latin or in the vernacular?

My views on this question are still the same as those contained in an article written for the Fortnightly Review, Vol. 18, p. 13. Permit me to repeat them as there given:—

His Eminence, Cardinal Mercier, is convinced that it is neither necessary, nor advisable, to retain Latin as the medium of instruction in Philosophy, and his arguments in favor of substituting French may be applied with equal force to any other living language.

In the preface of his "Traité Elementaire de Philosophie" (Louvain, 1906) he writes: "We have chosen French as the medium of instruction. There is no more logical language, than the French. Besides, every priest is by vocation an apostle of truth, and to perform his sacred duty well he must be familiar with the language of those to whom he appeals."

"No doubt, Latin is the liturgical and canonical language of the Church. It is also the language of St. Thomas, whose principles form the basis of Scholastic Philosophy, and whom every

priest should be able to study in the original. Again it is an incontestable fact that the practice of the Latin tongue offers many advantages to seminarians or students about to enter upon the study of Theology, and we easily understand, that on account of these superior advantages few professors will care to depart from the time-honored tradition of teaching Philosophy in Latin. But—is Latin essential to the teaching of Scholastic Philosophy, because this science was originally taught in Latin? Or is it at least preferable? We think not. Do the professors of Greek and Latin literature use the language of Homer to explain the *Iliad*, or that of Cicero to comment upon his 'Pro Archia'? Do the professors of exegesis explain the book of Genesis in Hebrew, or the Acts of the Apostles in Greek? The most celebrated masters of Scholastic Philosophy readily consult St. Thomas' commentaries on Aristotle, though it is highly probable that St. Thomas never read the *Stagirite* in the original, but knew him only through translations. We see, therefore, that it is not necessary to expound an author in his own language. On the contrary, I firmly believe that the best way to introduce the student to the Philosophy and Theology of St. Thomas in its original is to use a modern tongue. And I base my assertion on a twofold experience. During the five years that I was engaged in teaching Scholastic Philosophy in the seminary of Mechlin, I tried my best to aid the students in assimilating the Latin manual of Gonzalez. For this purpose I wrote a Latin compendium of questions and answers, and had copies of it struck off for their use. But I was ill-repaid for my pains. I had eventually to explain both the manual and the compendium in French.

"Then for some time I followed a different method. For the first half-hour I explained in Latin, for the second half-hour in French. In a short time I perceived, that during the second half-hour I had the attention of my students, while the first half left them drowsy and inattentive. It was even said that the students awaited the second half-hour, before considering it worth while to pay attention.

"Accordingly, as soon as I could obtain permission, I began to teach Philosophy in French; and when the close attention of my

pupils told me plainly that I had been understood, I profited by their good disposition to render briefly into Latin the thesis, which they had just heard developed and proved in French. This time the Latin of St. Thomas was listened to and comprehended, and, what is more, it was relished and admired.

"This same experience was repeated later on at the University of Louvain, and I take the liberty to invite anyone of my colleagues engaged in teaching Philosophy, to try it for himself. A double success will attend his effort. Scholastic Philosophy will endear itself to the student because he catches its spirit, and in two or three years he will attain such knowledge and affection for St. Thomas as to be able to read his original works and those of his commentators without difficulty."

To the objection that the beginner in Philosophy has already had a full course in Latin, and should be able to understand that language, when he enters on the study of Philosophy, Cardinal Mercier makes answer thus: "Yes, he has had a Latin course; but ninety-nine times out of a hundred he is unable to comprehend a single Latin phrase, when he hears it. (?) How then will he be able to understand a whole discourse, which represents to him a host of new ideas, whose abstract character demands every effort of his limited intelligence?"

These remarks of the eminent Cardinal and renowned philosopher, whose works have contributed so much to the inauguration of a new epoch in Scholastic Philosophy, merit our full approbation, and will, we think, find a responsive chord in all teachers of Philosophy, who are interested in their work and desirous of imparting to their students a thorough and practical knowledge of this most difficult, but, at the same time, most useful, branch of study.

We might add that it is a very illogical proceeding, to say the least, to write works destined for the learned and scientific in modern languages, and, on the other hand, to force the uninitiated student to digest a condensed edition of Latin terminology. It is no wonder that seminarians are so often ill-prepared for the Theological course; no wonder that within a short time philosophical terms become to them unknown quantities; no wonder that

their Theological studies lack that solid foundation and support which only Christian Philosophy can provide.

"As only a deep philosopher can be a great theologian, so only those who have mastered the elements of Philosophy, can hope to acquire any technical knowledge of the sacred science. There is not a department of Philosophy, which they have not again and again to go back to: Scarce a single theological question, that does not involve conceptions, which it is the business of philosophy to elucidate." (Hogan, *Clerical Studies*.)

But to impart this fundamental knowledge we must follow the natural order of perception. Teach the students to think first in their own language, a language, in which their thoughts keep abreast of their ideas; then, when they have become familiar with the ideas, let them proceed to study these ideas in the medium of the old masters. This is the only logical, because it is the natural manner of apprehension. Our teachers must adopt it if they wish to bring about the revival of Scholastic Philosophy which the Church so ardently desires.

Do not understand me to say anything against the use of Latin as such. On the contrary, it is my candid opinion that the Latin language can express better than any other the principles of Rational Philosophy. There is hardly a language that is more adapted to that purpose. Its precise terminology, its flexibility of cases, the expression of dependence in the different clauses of the sentence, its ease in accenting the main thought, its natural brevity, its unchangeableness as a dead language,—all go to make Latin the best medium of philosophical thought. But all this presupposes a certain condition of knowledge and ease of expression on the part of the student, and this is lacking in 99 out of a hundred students. (When Mercier says, however, that they cannot comprehend a single Latin phrase when they hear it, I consider this an exaggeration.)

It is my custom, therefore, to first explain in English, then have the pupils make an abstract of the Latin, and lastly, have them to answer in class both in Latin and in English. This gives them both the terminology and the understanding of the terms, and makes Philosophy practical and interesting, and a valuable asset.

for the student of Theology and the preacher of the Word of God.

9. Question:—A. Method of Teaching? B. Method of Study?

A. The manner of teaching will naturally differ according to the different branches. In Philosophy we find two methods in use: the lecture method and the catechetical method of question and answer. For pupils taking a post-graduate course the lecture will serve its purpose admirably. But for our clerics who have just finished the college-course the other method should be adopted, or both combined. Allow me to outline my own system and judge for yourselves how it can be improved upon.

At the beginning of the class I ask the lesson, which was explained in the previous hour. These questions are asked in Latin and follow the order of the textbook. Each student has a type-written copy of the questions for his own use. The student must answer in Latin as far as he is able, except in the lengthier arguments, in which case I have him to state the general argument in Latin, and the proofs of the major and minor in English. Side-questions and illustrations as well as questions which summarize the lesson are asked in English, and are for the purpose of stimulating independent thought, and making the student see the practical value of the subject-matter. At the same time this tells me better than the memorized Latin, whether the student has understood the text or not. If not, I explain the matter again. This occupies the greater half of the hour.

Then I take up the next lesson, and using the questions again as a guide, I explain the text in English. Usually after each small paragraph, I ask one of my pupils to read the Latin answer out of the book, but in a condensed or abstract form. These answers are a good preparation for the making of abstracts, required for each lesson. This is the order I follow in the regular classes.

Besides the regular classes, we have repetition and test-exercises every two weeks, sometimes oral, but generally written. The students must also write essays, discussions and debates ac-

cording to the subject-matter under study, and arranged in such a way that each student will have his turn once or twice a month. The delivery of these essays can be combined with the hour of Philosophy or form a part of the Reading Circle. The teacher must not only indicate the subject of the essay, etc., but also the sources and the general arrangement and make all the necessary corrections. These corrections should be very thorough and regard not only the words and phrases, but the whole structure and logical arrangement of the thoughts expressed. As a stimulus to the student to do his best, the tasks should be copied in a special book to be preserved for the use of future classes.

Besides the written work, students should also be encouraged to do collateral reading, and the teacher should indicate from time to time good books or passages or articles referring to their studies. Do not attach too much weight to their lamentations of not having enough time. They can always find time to do those things they want to do, and as long as they take interest in a branch, they will find time to devote to it. Besides, to allow a student to spend an hour and a half on a lesson, when it ought to be studied in half an hour, is to encourage habits of laziness and indifference, which will mar his whole future career. More students are spoiled by lack of work, than by too much work.

What was said above of the method in teaching Philosophy can be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the study of History and Holy Scripture, if they must be taught in the Philosophy Course. Repetitions in these branches can be reduced to one a month, and the making of an abstract of the answers can be dispensed with.

In the classes of Natural Science each branch will require its own method. Too much stress, however, cannot be laid upon the necessity of individual experiment and observation in the laboratory, and of drawing and black-board work. To go further into details will hardly be necessary.

The teaching of the languages, both classic and modern, should be limited to reading and translation into English. A little grammar written on the board from time to time and copied by the students, would be sufficient for the understanding of the struc-

ture of the sentence and of the forms of the verbs; the meaning of the words could be found in the dictionary. In the study of the particular language necessary for the individual province, the student should make a special study of grammar, translate *from* the English, as well as *into* English, do written work, and also carry on conversation in that language.

The teaching of Rhetoric should embrace not only the principles of *composition* and *delivery*, stated theoretically, but should give every student ample opportunity to make use of those principles. Essays of description and illustration, original stories, short expositions, or even sermons, should be encouraged. If specially good, they might be published in the monthly or annual magazine of the province. In reading and speaking the essential requirements should always be insisted on, namely, slow but fluent articulation, strong but unaffected modulation and emphasis, a natural and judicious use of gesture. This can be done best in a Reading Circle. The teacher, however, should not be satisfied with attending the Circle and giving some general criticism of the speech after delivery, but he should take a special interest in each pupil, and drill him beforehand, so that the final delivery in the Circle is not merely a trial or experiment, but the finished and perfect product of well-directed effort. In the pieces chosen from Readers or other books, I think, preference should be given to prose rather than to poetry, to sacred subjects rather than to profane matters, to stories rather than to descriptions. I would especially recommend paraphrases of the narratives and parables of the Gospel as a preparation for future sermons, dialogues and spoken plays as an exercise in modulation, short stories in one's own words to learn impromptu expression and command of language, emotional speeches for the cultivation of gesture, and daily practice of slow table-reading to acquire correct articulation.

Music should embrace 1) the Study of Notation in both plain chant and figured music, 2) instrumental music, preferably that of the organ, and lastly, 3) singing, at least choral and solo singing. Part-singing is not necessary, but, if the whole course can be developed sufficiently to take part in it, it will add very much to the interest and pleasure of the class. Though the students

should be able to sing the songs by note, still, to get the full value out of them, they should learn them by heart. Special care should be exercised that every one of the students get the full benefit out of the class. Let him who cannot sing, sing so much the more until he can sing. To develop interest and awaken a spirit of harmony, let each one be taught to sing the solo part of the song he likes, with the whole class joining in the chorus.

B. So much for the method of teaching,—now some final remarks on the method of study. It is the duty of the professor to render his lectures instructive, interesting and useful; but all his efforts will be in vain, if the student does not care to apply himself, or does not know how.

This, I think, is a point of the greatest importance for all students, not only of Philosophy, but of every other branch of study.

Man's intellectual development is very much like the development of his body, except that the body nourishes itself automatically and instinctively, whereas for intellectual development man must first learn to study according to a correct method, in order to get the best results. In all else the analogy is complete.

1.) Just as material food must be cooked or rendered palatable in some way or other, then arranged, seasoned, and presented in an attractive form,—so too the intellectual food must first be boiled down by individual research and discussion in the schools of thought, then arranged by the author of the textbook, and seasoned by illustration and presented in an attractive form by the professor. All this, however, is merely preparatory to the real work done by the student.

2. The body must masticate the food and mix it thoroughly with saliva and the gastric juices, in order to digest it properly.—This the student does by reading attentively the lesson before him or following the instructions of the professor, and then mixing it thoroughly with his own thoughts and images, and considering it from all sides, so that he understands it perfectly. But even that is not enough. He wants this knowledge to remain with him and become a part of his mind.

3.) The third stage consists in the absorption of the food into the system. The stomach and intestines are lined with a mucous membrane laid in folds and fitted with cells, which absorb and extract the real food from the indigestible matter which merely carries it, and this food is thence transferred through the liver and lymphatic ducts to the blood, which circulates it through the body.—Thus the student, incapable of retaining all he hears or reads in the exact form in which it is received, must separate the real thoughts from the verbiage which surrounds and carries it, write it down, and then transfer this synopsis in a well-ordered form to his store of knowledge.

4.) Lastly, comes the real act of nutrition, by which each cell selects and appropriates its proper food and transforms it into its own substance, thereby multiplying the cells and developing the tissues, and thus preserving and developing the whole body.—In like manner the mind must select and appropriate to itself the important points to be remembered, and, by rehearsing them again and again, obtain complete mastery over them. By this means they are transformed into its very nature and become the source of new ideas and discoveries, thereby increasing the store of knowledge and developing all the powers of the mind.

The last two points are neglected almost entirely by the average student. Instead of making a synopsis of his lesson and picking out the important thoughts and fixing his mind on these, he tries to memorize the whole lesson just as it stands, or, worse still, is satisfied with reading it through several times and persuading himself that he has done his duty. But he has only deceived himself and made the work doubly hard for future study.

What our students of Philosophy need, therefore, is not so much a greater variety of subjects and easier textbooks, as rather a greater amount of application and more system in their display of it. Many students can read a whole page without having any idea of what the author is talking about. It seems as if their minds are asleep, or merely following the aimless flights of their fancy. The only way that such students can overcome their listlessness, is by forcing themselves to make an abstract of their lesson and writing down the important points to be remembered.

By condensing the matter into a small space they get a better grasp of it and understand the sequence of thought, the logical and oratorical structure of what they read. This gives the mind both power and confidence, and makes study a pleasure instead of a pain. In fact, it is the only hope of a poor memory—to write out a short abstract of one's work and to go over it again and again.

But more than that, it teaches you also how to develop the thought, how to bring in the attendant circumstances, how to heighten the effect, how to introduce the illustrations, etc. Knowledge is worth little to you, until you have made it your own so that you can reproduce it in a precise and definite form. And one of the best ways to find out how little you have understood of a given thesis, is to try to explain it to others, either orally or, better still, in writing, for "writing maketh the exact man"; in other words, to *express* the idea is to *impress* it indelibly on mind and memory.

Of course, such a system may be tedious and may go against the grain and will require no small labor on the part of the student; but labor is unavoidable if the end is to be gained; for study, like digestion, cannot be carried on by proxy. A systematic personal activity is absolutely necessary, and the greater the difficulty, the greater also will be the pleasure in overcoming it. True success never lived on Easy Street.

DISCUSSION.

FR. DIDYMUS:—In shaping the plan of studies for the students of Philosophy, we must guard against the danger of overburdening them with a variety of branches.

1. We must not overlook that our Clerics, in comparison with Seminarians, are at a disadvantage as to the time allotted to their studies. They have to recite the Office, go to their meditations and attend different devotions, such as the "Holy Hour," etc. Now, I am not speaking against these religious exercises, but the fact remains that they take up considerable time, and we must take this fact into consideration when mapping out the plan of studies.

2. Again, we should not deprive the philosophical course of its distinctive character. The philosophical course must remain a course of Philosophy; a course in which Philosophy predominates; it must not de-

teriorate into a course of arts and sciences with Philosophy holding a secondary place. A course of 16 periods a week of which only 6 are devoted to the study of mental Philosophy can hardly be called a philosophical course.

3. It seems to me that the study of Philosophy differs to a great extent from other studies. We all know its subtle nature; its many intricate problems and the difficulties encountered by the student in solving them. The explanation of the Lector may be ever so lucid and exhaustive, the student himself may for the time being be perfectly convinced of having fully grasped the explanation, or the gist of the argument, but when he gets to his room all seems to be gone; when he thought to have mastered the problem it slipped from his mind, and only after laborious and intensive reflection is the student to some extent able to recall one thought after another and collect the parts to reconstruct the argument. It is only by continuous concentration of all the faculties of the mind that the student may hope to make a fair progress in Philosophy. If concentration of the mind is anywhere necessary, then certainly in the pursuit of this science of sciences. But how is such mental concentration possible if the student in the course of the day has to jump from one branch into another, if his attention and his mental activities are divided among so many various branches?

4. The philosophical course should be kept within its own boundaries and not be permitted to invade foreign territory, such as Theology or the Classics. It has been remarked that if the student of Philosophy is limited to the study of mental Philosophy, the Natural Sciences and Hebrew, his time will not be sufficiently occupied. I can not understand this statement since, in my opinion, Philosophy alone is so rich in material that it certainly has no need to go begging from other branches to fill out the time.

For these reasons I think that the philosophical course should embrace, besides Philosophy proper, only such branches as have a direct bearing on the former. I except Hebrew, which study may be admitted, because no provision has been made for it in the College-Curriculum.

FR. CLAUDE:—Speaking of Ven. Duns Scotus and Scotistic Philosophy, I would like to remark that though the works of Duns Scotus contain many solid and practical gems of thought, they are too much hidden from the popular mind in the dark, unfathomed ocean of philosophical verbiage, and like the modest flowers are born to blush unseen by the general public, and waste their sweetness on the desert air of our libraries. To modernize and popularize our Scotistic Philosophy by well illustrated and interesting essays in our Catholic periodicals, or in separate pamphlets, should be our aim and endeavor, and the slogan of this Conference could well be formulated thus:

Scotus to the fore. The defender of the Immaculate Conception, and of everything Catholic, needs no apology.

FR. ERMIN:—If there is one resolution of this Conference that appeals to me more than another, it is that which provides for a three-year philosophical course beginning immediately after the novitiate. The **Philosophy in Vernacular.** reasons for this change, as set forth by Fr. Claude, appear quite convincing, and I think it will be met with hearty approval from many sources.

However, we shall also meet those who will exclaim in disgust, "Two years of that dry stuff was bad enough; why make it three?" You may tell me that I should be ashamed even to mention such an unscholarly prejudice in this assembly; but it exists. You may frown upon it, but you must contend with it. I hold that it is an essential part of the philosophical course to overcome this adverse sentiment.

We may well ask, why do so many ecclesiastical students approach the philosophical course as if it were a bitter medicine that the doctor had prescribed; and why must we hear so many priests and theological students confess that they did not appreciate Philosophy while they were studying it? Is it perhaps because Philosophy, like a proud and self-sufficient mistress that has been wooed by the mightiest intellects of the ages, loves to strut upon a higher plane courting primarily the attention of those brighter minds that will enthuse over her brilliant past conquests; while she frowns upon the problems of our modern day, disdaining at least to appear in the dress of our plebeian vernacular?

Let us admit that, in a sense, Philosophy is not simply a subsidiary study, that it is a self-sufficient unit; but let us also admit that it is a part of the entire seminary curriculum—one of three departments. As a part, it has its obligations to the entire curriculum as well as to that which precedes and that which follows. Philosophy must take care of one period and one part of the priestly education. The final demand which will be made of this middle department, Philosophy, is not so much that it may develop philosophers with a thorough knowledge of the subject-matter contained in the textbook, as rather that it give us priests who are prepared to meet the unphilosophical vagaries of our day and to expose their fallacy to the satisfaction of the popular mind.

Some of our students of Philosophy will eventually have the opportunity of a post-graduate course, as their teachers had, and, let us hope, we will look up to them in years to come; but now in the class-room we must reckon with the average student. He will be a priest, and a priest must acquire knowledge not merely that he may possess it, but primarily that he may impart it; and the medium of imparting is the vernacular,—in our case, English. The teacher of Philosophy, I maintain, can not escape the necessity of teaching English Composition and Rhetoric while he teaches Philosophy. Nor will I admit that this is imposing a foreign, distracting element upon the course; on the contrary, it should be made a stimulating and helpful influence.

"Writing maketh an exact man." Put before your student a thesis in its modern dress; tell him to adapt his treatise to the intelligence of the average reader, and therefore to avoid all scholastic expressions and latinisms; and see whether he does not emerge from this "unscholarly" proceeding with a better understanding of his subject than what the classroom could impart. Here is "English" to be taught by the Lector of Philosophy. Such an exercise teaches the student to look habitually for the modern application of the eternal truths, and the pages of his textbook will begin to assume a new color. He should find a keen satisfaction in acquiring the ability to express in choice, forceful English what he is learning in Philosophy.

It is surely a mistake to assume that the course in English has been completed in the preparatory department; and I firmly believe that the cause of Philosophy itself would be best served if it gave careful, systematic attention to the written and spoken English word. After all, your most brilliant intellectual attainments are practically nil unless they can find expression; and our medium of expression is English. Indeed, if we fully realize the all-embracing value of English as the priest's medium in teaching and preaching, then we shall not be tempted to neglect its study during the important years of Philosophy.

FR. GEORGE:—That a fair knowledge of Natural Sciences is a necessary part of a complete liberal education, which should be given to future students of Theology is the unanimous opinion of educators.

Natural Sciences. The question, however, to be solved is when and where should they be studied? Should they be studied in the Preparatory Seminary or in the Philosophical Department? In the Philosophical Department and not in the Preparatory Seminary is, in my opinion, the correct answer to this important question.

It may be objected, that nowadays the Natural Sciences are very generally part of the curriculum of classical schools. I readily admit, that this practice is quite general in the schools. I do not admit that it is the right thing. How did this practice originate? If we consult the history of education we will learn that this practice goes back to the influence of Protestantism. It might seem strange to bring this educational phenomenon into connection with religion. But nevertheless that connection exists. Before and after the so-called Reformation the Catholic system of education recognized two distinct types of schools representing the two successive stages of classical studies and the school of philosophy called Lyceum. Each had its well-defined purpose and sphere of work. The former gave the student a solid and thorough literary and rhetorical training, the latter completed the work of the former by giving him a solid philosophical and scientific training. The study of the languages and their accessory branches such as History, Geography, was the task assigned to the lower schools; the study of

Philosophy together with Natural Sciences and Mathematics was taken up in the Lyceum. In the Protestant schools the study of Philosophy never found much favor and was soon dropped. Mathematics and Natural Sciences were crammed into the curriculum of the classical school, the course of classical studies was stretched out so as to cover eight or nine years, the well-founded distinction between the two schools was more or less wiped out, and the hybrid of the modern classico-scientific school was the result of this process. State regulations upon which Protestantism always had to rely for support, made this type of school the ruling one and forced private schools to conform more or less to this official type, if they wished to continue their existence. In spite of this hostile pressure from without, Catholic secondary education has not ceased to champion the cause of pedagogical truth and has at least saved the study of Philosophy from destruction. Ever since this process of amalgamation has become a fact, the clamoring for reform has been heard.

Dr. Paulsen, in his notable history on higher education in Germany, calls this process of amalgamation Utraquism, which he defines as "der Versuch die altklassische und die modern-realistiche Bildung zu vereinigen." The learned author concludes his historial investigations with the remark: "Mir ist klar geworden, dass die Schwierigkeiten, mit welchen unser höheres Schulwesen kämpft, wesentlich von einem Punkte ausgehen: dem, was ich als Utraquismus bezeichnet habe." (Gesch. des Gelehrten Unterrichts auf den Deutschen Schulen und Univers. 2 Auf. 2B. S. 426, 441, 636). Here again we have the soundness and wisdom of the position taken by the Catholic schools in former times vindicated in an important point.

It is wise to heed this lesson and to follow the practice common in these schools formerly and even now observed in the schools of some of the religious orders, namely of teaching the natural sciences in connection with Philosophy and not to cram them into the classical course.

All the time that can be had during the six years of the classical studies should be given to the study of the languages and the accessory branches related to them. Natural sciences are heterogeneous to this group of branches and should not take away time that can be spent more profitably. Unity and concentration are of vital importance for successful and thorough classical training. This unity and concentration is promoted by keeping the Natural Sciences out of the curriculum of the classical department. On the other hand, the Natural Sciences are by their nature accessory branches to Philosophy and homogeneous to the same. Their proper place, therefore, is the philosophical department.

As the fruitful study of Philosophy presupposes some mental maturity attained by previous training, so also the fruitful study of the sciences. Mere cramming the head and burdening the memory with some scientific facts and formulas is not a real study of sciences. To fill out or rather to waste time with such memory drilling is nonsense. Memory and fancy

are properly drilled and trained by the study of language, literature and history. It is regard for the natural development of the faculties of the soul that sound pedagogy demands that the study of Philosophy be taken up after the mind has attained some degree of maturity. The same regard should determine the place of the Natural Sciences. The study of the Sciences also will then become most fruitful when the intellectual or thinking powers begin to develop. This is the time after the classical course, the period of early youth. History, Psychology, Pedagogy all point to the philosophical department as the proper place for the study of the Natural Sciences.

Let them be taught there and they will bring rich fruits, if properly treated.

If, however, the Natural Sciences are to be studied in the Philosophical Department it will be necessary that three years be set apart for these **Three Years' studies**. Philosophy is the main branch of study in this **Philosophy**. of the National Sciences. Two years is too short a period of time, if justice shall be done to both. Three years will be sufficient for a thorough course in both. Specialization in these branches is not the purpose or the goal. These studies are to form the crown and complement of that general liberal education necessary for a successful study of Theology.

As to the question which of the Natural Sciences should be studied it would seem that the following are to be taken: Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Biology and Physiology.

FR. HUGH:—With regard to the duration of the philosophical course I wish to emphasize the fact that, although studies may not be carried on systematically during the novitiate, yet that year ought not be considered lost in the clerical training. Certainly much can be done by the novices, perfecting themselves in the Greek and Latin languages, reading selections from the Fathers of the Church and ascetical writers; also in history they will become familiar with the origin and development of the Franciscan Order and coincident historical data. Again, there is the ascetical training of the mind and heart, which surely constitutes an important element in the preparation for the sacred ministry. Hence, do not three years seem rather long in philosophy? Of course, I suppose the year of classics after the novitiate to be eliminated. However, I think the three years' course ought to be given a trial. It is only by experience we can learn certain things. For this reason I endorse the three years' course.

FR. FERDINAND:—There is no doubt in my mind that, if the Natural Sciences are taught in connection with Philosophy, a three-year course is an absolute necessity. With the extensive field to be covered

and the long laboratory periods required in the case of the sciences, there is barely sufficient time for the study of Speculative Philosophy, even if the course embraces three years. Three full years of Philosophy, empiric and speculative judiciously mixed, to the exclusion of all classical branches, is my ideal of a thorough modern course of Philosophy.

FR. ALOYSIUS:—The necessity of a larger acquaintance with, and of a more intensive application to the study of the Natural Sciences in our schools, is admitted at all hands. For some time past, the secular **Natural Sciences**, secondary and higher institutions of learning of this country have fairly monopolized the field of modern experimental science and, by so doing, they have gained the attention and the good will of the average intelligent young man. This fact, perhaps, explains to some extent the unusually large number of students frequenting the secular schools and colleges, whilst some of our Catholic institutions are continually confronted with the vital problem of retaining and increasing the number of their students.

The lively interest of the greater portion of intelligent young men in all that pertains to the Natural Sciences, may in part be due to the materialistic world-view of the present generation, but it is a fact which must be reckoned with in the deliberations concerning the advancement of Catholic and Franciscan education. In this important educational movement towards scientific training we can no longer stand aside idle and unconcerned, if we wish to command the respect and retain the confidence of our Catholic young men. A fairly good acquaintance with the latest results of scientific investigation forms, moreover, not only a part of a general education nowadays, but is, above all, necessary for the priest of God who is called upon to defend Christian truth and Catholic doctrine against all attacks, whether these come from modern infidel philosophy or from the godless man of science. But there is little hope of victory for us unless we meet our adversaries on their own field and with their own weapons. A purely defensive warfare leads only to ultimate defeat.

The study of the Natural Sciences has a threefold advantage: it serves to acquaint the student with the results of modern investigation in the various fields of science and thus provides him with a broad and solid foundation for future philosophical speculation; it trains his mind to a careful observation of natural phenomena which, combined with logical reasoning and judicious comparisons, is a means of mental training not inferior to that offered by any other discipline; it, finally, leads the student to a more complete knowledge and sympathetic appreciation of the material world in which he lives, of the universal laws by which it is governed, of the beauty of its plant and animal life, and last, but not least, of the organic structure and the various functions of his own organism,

and thus lays the scientific foundation of a rational mode of life, which is a prerequisite for success in any field of labor.

But to achieve this, the study of the Natural Sciences should not be taken up prematurely. It requires a certain mental development and maturity of judgment, and thus would find a logical place in the curriculum of Philosophy, the more so on account of its intimate relation with Philosophy. For this reason, Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Physiology form the bulk of the work in the undergraduate (college) department of the American universities. Still, the high school department of our preparatory seminaries should not, in my opinion, be entirely deprived of the opportunity of giving to our young men a general fundamental knowledge of the sciences of Botany, Zoology and Physiology. The scientific treatment of these disciplines should be reserved for Philosophy, but a general acquaintance with them, which gradually leads the student to a better understanding of nature and its beauties, should not be denied the student during the plastic years of his early secondary education. A judicious and well-regulated elementary course in the Natural Sciences will also serve to dispel the feeling of listlessness which an exclusive classical and literary education is apt to cause in the unsettled mind of the average boy of fifteen or sixteen.

Physiography, descriptive Botany and Zoology, and Physiology in its general principles should, therefore, form part of the high school work of our students. Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy, Biology and experimental Physiology are more profitably taken up in connection with Philosophy.

The question of the place to be assigned to the study of Physics is more difficult to answer satisfactorily. While there can be no doubt that the more advanced student of Philosophy derives greater benefit from the study of Physics, we cannot overlook the danger of overcrowding the department of Philosophy and overtaxing the strength and the goodwill of our students. Neither do I think it advisable from a pedagogical viewpoint to divide the study of Physics between the preparatory seminary and Philosophy. The necessity of having two men trained in this science, and the additional expense of providing a second physical laboratory also speak against this division. It would, therefore, perhaps be better to complete the study of Physics in our preparatory schools, devoting to it the last two years, which correspond to the first two years of college, and hence should be put upon a collegiate basis. This, together with elementary Botany, Zoology and Physiology would constitute a fair amount of scientific training for our preparatory seminaries and prevent an overcrowding of the department of Philosophy.

The study of Mathematics, including at least plane trigonometry, should be completed in the preparatory schools.

With the introduction of the study of the Natural Sciences into the curriculum of Philosophy, the extension of the course of Philosophy over

three years becomes imperative. But success will depend not only upon the amount of time to be devoted to this study, but, above all, upon the methods to be followed.

Confining myself to the study of the Natural Sciences in the department of Philosophy, I can not but express my fears of ultimate failure, unless the study of Chemistry, Biology and Physiology is based principally upon individual work in the laboratory. A purely theoretical course in these sciences, even if accompanied by frequent demonstrations on the part of the teacher, would, perhaps, be worse than useless. It may give the student a great deal of information regarding the sciences, but it will scarcely develop in him a love for them nor will it give him that scientific training which alone would justify the expenditure of money, time and energy. Anyone who has had the sad experience of learning Chemistry from a text-book will readily agree with me. The equipment of chemical and biological laboratories—they may easily be combined—will, therefore, be necessary. But the money thus spent is well spent and will prove a very good investment.

But the laboratory methods in teaching the sciences demands, above all, a specially trained teacher. We may by patient labor and much experimenting upon those entrusted to us, fit ourselves fairly well to teach with some success the Classics, or History, or Mathematics, but it would spell failure, if not disaster, to make this attempt in Chemistry. Previous training alone can give the teacher the experience and self-confidence necessary in the laboratory. Specialization, giving the teacher a comprehensive knowledge of his field of labor and an intimate acquaintance with the technique of modern experimental work, is here indispensable.

The order in which the sciences should be taught is determined largely by their relation to the various parts of Philosophy. Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy, serving as introduction to Cosmology, should find a place in the first year of philosophical studies; general Biology should precede, and Physiology at least accompany the study of Psychology, both rational and experimental. In this manner the study of the sciences will prepare the mind of the student for successful work in Philosophy by furnishing the experimental facts for philosophical speculation, while the sciences, in their turn, will find their complement in Philosophy.

FR. HUGH:—Much attention is given nowadays to natural sciences. Much of this is owing to the materialistic tendency of our age. A priest who is proficient in some special branch may gain recognition and dispel any possible idea that Catholic training is obsolete and not abreast of the times. Apart from specialists who are trained to fill a chair of teaching in our colleges and seminaries, we cannot expect to make experts by our courses in Natural Sciences. People don't expect the priest to be an expert in any branch of Natural Sciences. Such a degree of knowledge and proficiency in the Natural Sciences ought to be fostered in our semi-

naries as is usually found in men of liberal education. Sociology ought to be taught extensively in connection with Philosophy and Theology. A thorough knowledge of this science is expected of the priest in our turbulent times. In general, Natural Sciences ought to be treated as subsidiary to Philosophy. I am rather skeptical about the value of more intense and extensive study of Natural Sciences as part of the regular course. Let that be more for individual students who are interested in such work and are qualifying to become experts and specialists in some particular branch. Hence, I wish to add a warning not to exaggerate the importance of the Natural Sciences for the training of the priest, and not to give too much time to them to the detriment of their liberal and spiritual training. Experimenting and following a hobby in some branch of this kind might prove very attractive and cause the inexperienced young man to lose too much time in such pursuits, whereas his principal aim ought always to be to cultivate the things of the mind.

FR. FERDINAND:—Of course, only the elements of the Natural Sciences should be taught in the preparatory seminary. I am aware that some are opposed to nature study in preparatory schools; because, as they maintain, the boys derive no benefit therefrom. The same thing may be said of every branch of the curriculum. If the teachers are competent, the boys will learn. If the teachers are wanting in scientific or pedagogical training, how can the boys be expected to benefit by their instructions? But who will say that the study itself, if properly managed, offers no advantages, no delights to the pupils? There is so much that is formative and instructive, so much that is interesting and delightful even in elementary nature study, that educators the world over have long since recognized its educational value, and it is now regarded as part and parcel of every preparatory curriculum. I am insisting only on the fundamentals of the easier branches, such as Botany, Zoology, Physical Geography and Physics for the preparatory course. Chemistry and whatever falls under the heads of Biology should be treated in connection with Philosophy.

FR. URBAN:—The plan for a three years' course in Philosophy has been given much consideration and discussion by the Friars of the several provinces during the past months. While no consensus of opinion exists with regard to this tentative plan, yet the greater number of Friars advocate its adoption. There should be no objection to it on account of the additional year in Philosophy because the length of the clerical course in years remains the same as heretofore. Nor should the objection be valid that we are going to devote too much time to the Natural Sciences. The New Code of Canon Law, and also the Ratio Studiorum Ordinis require that, with regard to the study of Natural Sciences, our curriculum should adapt itself to the best requirements of standard secular institutions. That's our aim exactly.

It has been said that the present, more intense interest in the study of Natural Sciences is due to the materialistic tendency of the age; and that we as Franciscans must not allow ourselves to be captivated by such a tendency. However, permit me to point out that by taking a real scholarly interest in these subjects we are but following the example of the earlier Franciscan schoolmen who took an abiding interest in the study of Nature. The mere mention of the name Roger Bacon should be an inspiration to every Franciscan student. It can not be denied that there was a tendency among the Franciscans of the earlier school to combine the study of Natural Science not only with Philosophy but even with Theology. The great Franciscan author, Friar Cuthbert, O. S. F. C., writes in his "Romanticism of St. Francis": "The immediate relationship between experimental science and the devotional temper of mind exhibited in St. Francis, may not be at once apparent; and in these days men are apt to regard the experimental scientist as temperamentally antagonistic to the theologian. As a matter of fact, however, the study of natural phenomena would seem to lie very close to the mystical temperament. It is in the facts of life that the true mystic seeks his knowledge, and to him phenomena are more eloquent than dialecticism. Adam Marsh, one of the most notable and pious of the early Franciscan Schoolmen, seems to have considered a study of physical phenomena together with the text of Scripture and the Holy Fathers as of more value than dialectical speculation in the study of theology." If, therefore, at the present time we show a greater leaning toward the study of Nature and advocate a more complete course of instruction in these departments, we are but following the example of great Franciscan Schoolmen who, as we all know, were not only scholarly but also quite orthodox. In my opinion, we should have the *three years' course in Philosophy at once.*

FR. HUGH:—By all means have our young men in all the Provinces to specialize and pursue a higher course in some University, preferably at the Collegio di S. Antonio in Rome; or at the **Specialization.** Catholic University in Washington. The more men are sent to these institutions, the better it will be for the Seraphic Order and the various Provinces in this country.

THE CURRICULUM OF THEOLOGY.

REV. THOMAS PLASSMAN, O. F. M.,
Lector of Theology, St. Bonaventure Seminary, Allegany, N. Y.

IN discussing the curriculum of the classical and that of the philosophical departments we have endeavored to provide for our students and clerics an education which emulates the best models and which bids fair to reach the highest standards of culture, thoroughness and efficiency. We sought to follow the path of a solid and liberal education as dictated by the foremost pedagogues and by our own experience. Needless to say, it is our purpose to follow this path still further, to the very limit, in fact, of our entire educational program. Yet as we reach the precincts of theology we feel that we should halt awhile with a view to ascertaining what particular demands the study of theology makes upon us as members of the Order of St. Francis.

Theology constitutes a vital issue in the Seraphic Order. The sacred science has most intimately and inseparably entwined itself with the history of our Order; the two have grown side by side, mutually supporting, nourishing, invigorating each other. Nor is this intimate interrelation purely historic, and certainly not merely the outcome of chance and circumstances. Neither should we seek its root in Catholic theology, which is older than the Franciscan Order, but in the very "ratio essendi" of the Order, in the aim and scope of its mission.

Much has been said and written in recent years in regard to the attitude of our Seraphic Father towards studies and learning. There are those who tell us that his attitude was not merely negative but openly averse and prohibitive. Perhaps we might remind these scholars that "the letter killeth, but the spirit quickeneth." It is impossible to read the great soul of St. Francis from a few documents. St. Francis did abhor, it is true, the "curiositates" of the "philosophantes," as St. Bonaventure calls them, and the "scientia mundana" which avails to nothing but "puffeth up," in the same manner as the Wise Man of Israel

condemned the worldly philosophy of Greece. But to say that St. Francis was averse to the sacred science of theology, which treats of God and things divine, is to ignore entirely the depth, the ardor and the lofty aspirations of his great soul. The rather should we say that by an intrinsic necessity he was compelled to love and venerate the "scientia de Deo" and to encourage the search for it among those of his brethren who had the necessary qualifications. In truth, there was nothing in all the world, outside of the "Body and Blood of our Lord" and the priests who administer these sacred Mysteries to others, for which St. Francis cherished a deeper regard and a holier affection than the "Verbum scriptum," or S. Scripture. In the parlance of those days the study of S. Scripture was theology, and the expounders of the "Sacra Pagina" were the theologians. "We ought to honor and venerate all theologians," says St. Francis beautifully in his Testament, "and those who minister to us the most holy Divine Words as those who minister to us spirit and life." As long as the study of theology did not mar the virtue of humility nor extinguish the spirit of devotion, "to which all things temporal must be subservient," St. Francis could only foster the love for it among his disciples, because it was sure to lead to God.

If we take a more legal aspect of the question we must say that the holy Rule does not mention explicitly the study of theology; nor should we reasonably look for it there. In it St. Francis set up as a standard, for himself and his followers, the *Imitation of Christ*. And as he desired "non sibi soli vivere sed aliis proficere" he combined the active with the contemplative life. He bade his brethren to go through the world, as the Chronicler puts it, "exhortando plus exemplo quam verbo." He lays stress on the good example as binding upon all his followers, laic and cleric, but for the latter there is the added obligation of the "Praedicatio Verbi divini," as the Rule clearly points out. The office of preaching, however, necessitates study and study calls for teachers. Thus it was that the Seraphic Father himself designated St. Anthony as our first lector of theology, and that, perhaps sooner than he might have foreseen, the teaching of theology was anchored in the very heart of the Order, and figured not merely as a passive course leading up to the sacred Ministry.

but as an active course, a regular profession. Nor could it be otherwise. The scope of the Order was large and lofty; if there were any limits, they were indicated only by the apostolic activity of Holy Church. The words we sing in St. Francis' Office, "Vade Francisce, repara domum meam quae labitur!" contained the Saviour's message to him and brooked no limitations. He took them "ad literam" and he meant to start from the very foundations. It was in the great and glowing zeal for his Master's House that his Order was born and was endowed with its unbounded apostolic ambition as well as with its wonderful elasticity and adaptability to all "tempora et loca et frigidas regiones."

If there should be any in our own ranks who would constrain the activity of the Order to a certain definite sphere, the pastoral work for example, they will pardon me if I quote for them Moses himself: "Interroga patrem tuum, et annuntiabit tibi; maiores tuos, et dicent tibi." It seems that the earliest and best followers of St. Francis hardly gave the question a thought, whether they should profess theology. They saw the Church in need of help; they witnessed the strenuous efforts of her theologians in repelling the inroads of heresy and pagan philosophy, and without waiting for further orders they threw themselves heart and soul into the contest. They gave their best powers to the study of the sacred and cognate sciences and penetrated to the very depth thereof. Thus they faced the world as the foremost defenders and expounders of the doctrine of the Church. And, as if turning around to his younger brethren in the Order, St. Bonaventure said in his usual calmness and serenity, though with the courage of conviction, that since the Order of Friars Minor had been given to the Church for the edification of the faithful and the defense of her doctrine, "sicut lucerna fugans in domo tenebras et operationes promovens," therefore it was necessary that it should be endowed with certain ornaments, and among these "Primum est vita irreprehensibilis, quae maxime sibimet prodest et alios aedificat. Secundum est scientia sacrae Scripturae, sine qua nec secure nec utiliter potest alios docere." In fact this great son of St. Francis confesses to a friend before God that the chief reason of his love and affection for the Order

of St. Francis had been its singular resemblance to the Church of Christ "quae primo incepit a piscatoribus simplicibus et postmodum profecit ad doctores clarissimos et eruditissimos."

A closer examination of the early curriculum of the Friars Minor shows that although the other sciences, such as philosophy, linguistics, physics and even medicine were included, yet theology remained the "studium per execellentiam." That the lectors took an eminently practical view of this study, even in its purely theoretical branches, is an obvious fact and may be regarded as one of the characteristics of the Franciscan School. Even Bl. Duns Scotus in his most subtle speculations does not lose sight of this. Their tendency was, not so much "Intelligo ut credam," but rather "Credo ut intelligam," if not "Amo ut intelligam." The "agere" and "amare" were generally put before, or at least on a level with "scire." Thus they moved forward with the other schools to the common goal "in sanctitate et doctrina."

Needless to say, it is our common end and aim to adhere to and to perpetuate the glorious traditions of the Order and to assert for theology the place of honor which our forefathers have assigned it. Let us bear in mind what the Order owes to Catholic theology and also what Catholic theology owes to the Order. Do we, then, mean to make professors of theology out of all our young men? God forbid. Yet we do mean to make theologians out of them—theologians in the truest sense of the term. Let us set up theology as their ideal ranking next to their religious and sacerdotal vocation. Ideals, as we all know, are profitable for the young and are not in the least hurtful even for the old, and though we may never fully attain them, yet the efforts spent in the attempt will bring out latent energies and powers. Whether our young men are to be active in the pulpit, in the confessional, among the people, in foreign missions, at the writing desk or in the cathedra, is immaterial as regards our present duty of giving them all a thorough and comprehensive course in theology. Hence, in drawing up our curriculum it will not do to single out what is practical in this country, or what is necessary and sufficient for the present needs of the province, nor even what is considered traditional in the Order. In so doing we would offend against the fundamental and best traditions of the Order, which

may be summarized as thoroughness, preparedness and an orthodox form of (sit venia verbo) modernism. If we limit ourselves to what is considered practical, we are bound to become superficial. If we would confine our program to our present sphere of labors, which are mainly pastoral, we would restrain progress and commit an injustice against the Order. If we were to indulge in an undue conservatism and place in the hands of our students only the *Summa* of St. Bonaventure we might be good Bonaventurians, but we would be poor apprentices of the Seraphic Doctor who wrote his own text-book to meet the actual problems of the day and who, be it remembered, was included, together with our other Masters at Paris in Roger Bacon's by no means complimentary phrase, "Isti magistri moderni."

What we should learn from these men is not their methods nor even all their theses, many of which are antiquated now, but the fundamental lines of their grand "*Summae*," their spirit of loyalty and obedience to Holy Church, and their broad conception of the sacred science of theology. Due reverence for the old and clear-sighted apprehension of the new: these two principles should guide us in discussing our curriculum. And when we apply the first principle to the many branches of the theological science it is at once apparent that none may be excluded from our consideration. The Order has had its share in all of them. When the divine Voice came to St. Francis, that he should repair God's House which was tottering, he did not stop to consider where to begin. He started where he stood; he picked up the first stone in the road and never ceased until his strength gave out. That spirit of readiness, amounting almost to impulsiveness, has ever characterized the Order. Its sons have moved forward not in regular formation like the army of Artaxerxes but rather like the swift, elastic regiments of Cyrus, always ready to attack where help was most needed. Bearing these facts in mind let us now pass in review the different theological sciences and let us briefly determine in each case their place and importance in our curriculum.

We start from the Deposit of Faith which Christ, the Supreme Doctor, Priest and Pastor has committed to His Church, and we consider it in its sources and in its channels. The sources may

be denoted as the *historical sciences* which are grouped around two centers, the Holy Bible and Holy Church; hence the subdivision, *biblical* and *ecclesiastical sciences*. The latter category deals with the history of the Church proper; the early witnesses who stood by her cradle, in Patrology and Patristics; the transmission and development of her doctrine, in the History of Dogma, and lastly, the material expression of her doctrine and usages in Christian Archaeology. The *systematic sciences*, on the other hand, are concerned with the channels through which the Church communicates to her flock what Christ committed to her, in her three-fold office of teaching, sanctifying and ruling. The office of teaching comprises primarily the doctrine proper or Dogmatic theology, which embraces both the defence of Revealed Truth or Apologetics and its exposition or Special Dogma. To this are closely allied the sciences of Homiletics, which appeals to the flock at large, and of Catechetics, which breaks the bread for the little ones. The office of sanctifying concerns itself with the *Corpus Christi Verum* and thus goes by the name of Liturgy, and the *Corpus Christi Mysticum*, and as such ascends the three steps of "mores" in Moral theology, "virtutes" in Ascetical théologie and "gratiae" in Mystical theology. There remains the office of ruling which is dealt with in Canon Law, while the art of ruling is treated in Pastoral theology.

Following this outline we first turn to the oldest theological science, S. Scripture. It is no small comfort to us to feel that a genuine love for the Holy Bible is instilled into the heart of the young friar in the Novitiate. The touching and childlike illusions to the Holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ scattered throughout the Rule and Testament of St. Francis cannot but deeply impress the mind of the novice. In his very first lesson he learns that "the Rule and the Life of the Friars Minor is this, to observe the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . ." No doubt, this spiritual attachment to the Inspired Word of God has been an inspiration to so many Franciscan scholars who were foremost in promoting the study of the biblical sciences. Thus, the first systematic treatise on Hermeneutics, whose main outline and principles are followed to this day, is found in the "Summa Theologica" of Alexander of Hales. The masterful exposition

of the "sensus mysticus" by St. Bonaventure has never been equalled since. And when at Paris scholastic speculation threatened to crowd out positive exegesis Roger Bacon sounded an earnest warning from Oxford. Had Roger's zeal and erudition been balanced by an equal measure of prudent moderation he might have succeeded in placing the study of S. Scripture on a broad and solid foundation which at a later date would have frustrated in advance the most vicious assaults of the enemy. Be this as it may, the principles he laid down have come to be adopted by the Council of Vienne, and, in our own day, in the Bull "Providentissimus," by the Biblical Commission, and, as Cardinal Gasquet has told the world, in the plan for the revision of the Vulgate. Many other monumental achievements were accomplished, or at least initiated, by Franciscans, such as, the first Moral Concordance by St. Anthony of Padua; the first Biblical Encyclopedia by Bartholomew the Englishman; the first Biblical Dictionary, the "Mammotrepton" by Marchesinus; the first Bible Polyglot by Cardinal Ximenez; the first Hebrew Concordance by Marius Calasius; the first printed Greek Grammar by Urbano da Belluno; the celebrated Postillae of Lyranus; the several Correctoria Franciscana; the voluminous Biblia Magna et Maxima of De La Haye. Nor should we omit works of larger dimensions, such as the Arabic Schools organized by the Tertiary Bl. Raymundus Lullus; the far-famed Oriental Institute on S. Pietro in Montorio, and the celebrated though short-lived Biblical Institute, the Museum Philologico-Sacrum Antwerpiense.

No one here present, I am sure, will take this enumeration of names and dates in the spirit of self-adulation. We have not come here for that purpose. At any rate, while it is perhaps equally as profitable as counting our pennies on Monday morning, it brings out the central fact that the Studium Sacrae Scripturae always has been, and there is no reason why it not always should be, a study of predilection in the Franciscan Order. Every Friar should take this truth to heart, from the Novice-Master to the Cooperator Missionis in the back woods. In the Novitiate the reading of a book of S. Scripture, say the Psalms or one of the Gospels, in Latin or better still in Greek, accompanied by a brief commentary and the recitation of texts from memory,

should be at least a weekly exercise. The philosophical course should continue this work on a scientific basis. The study of the Biblical Languages and perhaps also a concise course of General Introduction to S. Scripture may be conveniently and profitably distributed during the three years of philosophy, without interfering with the main work. Though the study of philosophy has an object all its own, yet it is to be remembered that in the ecclesiastical curriculum it is intended also as an immediate preparation for the systematic sciences of theology. Therefore it is very desirable that alongside of the study of philosophy there should be a similar preparation for the historical sciences, among which S. Scripture is foremost.

Here is a brief outline of our Scriptural studies. I would not advise that it be adopted formally at this Conference; I only wish to submit it to the consideration of the lectors. For the first year of philosophy I would suggest the Elements of General Introduction comprising the History of the Holy Bible and the History of the Holy People. The treatment should be chiefly historical. The purpose is to familiarize the students with technical names and titles and with the chief events and dates, also to give them a fairly good understanding of the leading principles of Hermeneutics, etc. For the second and third year I suggest the study of Hebrew and Biblical Greek and also one class a week in Biblical History. The latter can be made to extend over two or even over six years. Its chief advantage is to make the students read the entire Sacred Text in two or six sections, as the case may be, and to make him observant of the salient questions of Special Introduction as well as of the literary beauty and the spiritual wealth of the Word of God. The student should be taught to have his Note Book or "Thesaurus" always at his elbow; it will be a valuable companion when he begins to write sermons. The scientific treatment of Special Introduction it is well to combine with the study of exegesis which should be pursued in four classes weekly throughout the four years of theology. The tracts, "De Inspiratione," "De Canone" and "De Sensibus" may be taken up, no later than in the first year of theology, either in the class of Fundamental Dogma or of S. Scripture, as long as they are given full theological treatment.

The problems of criticism should be dealt with objectively and adequately. If any harm is feared, it is the professor's fault. Having received a thorough philological, historical and theological training the student is well prepared to take up exegesis proper and to draw from this study immense profit for his future work. Without such preparation our course in S. Scripture will eventually amount to a laborsome, unsatisfactory commentary of the Douay Version.

The lector should be allowed a certain latitude in the arrangement of the subject-matter for exegesis. Some prefer the historical order which follows practically the order of the books in the Bible; others, the logical order which groups the books according to their contents, viz., historical, prophetic and didactic; others again, the liturgical order which takes as a basis the Breviary and Missal. This is largely a matter of taste and also of the individual associations of the lector with other branches of study. Undoubtedly, it is a great advantage if the lector is not too self-sufficient but willing to adapt his course so as to benefit directly the courses of Dogmatic theology, Homiletics or Liturgy. Among the Franciscan commentators we find a strong tendency towards a mystical conception of the Sacred Volume, and, provided we accord due treatment to the literary, historical and critical aspect, we may find it most beneficial if we follow the plan adopted by Mother Church, who is after all the "optima interpres," in grouping the matter broadly under the three cycles of the Ecclesiastical Year.

The historical science next in order is Church History. A portion or section of history should be assigned to each year of our entire course, classical, philosophical and theological, not only because of the indispensable information the study of history imparts and of its value as a mental discipline and a cultural force, but also on account of the sobering and strengthening influence it exercises on the judgment and character of the student. It should not be a difficult matter for us to agree on a plan which is at once comprehensive, progressive and always adapted to the mental capacity of the pupil. In the Classical course the history of facts and fiction should predominate for the purpose of enriching the memory of the student, of arousing his imagination and

training his aesthetic sense. This end is attained through the study of the History of our own country, of the ancient and modern World, and, in the higher classes, of the Literature of the English, Greek and Latin languages together with Mythology. The study of philosophy prepares the student for the history of thought. It is well to extend the History of Philosophy over the three years. Biblical History will supplement this course and will draw from it its own specific advantages. After the history of human events and human thought there follows logically the history of God's work, the Church. It may be necessary for want of teaching personnel or for other reasons to assign Church History to the course of philosophy; but a true understanding and appreciation of the subject is best secured when the student is occupied with theology. This arrangement would also simplify the teaching of Church History in as much as many sections of the text-book may be conveniently taken over by the lectors of Patrology, of the History of Dogma and of Apologetics. Besides, we should be careful not to overburden the Curriculum of philosophy, not only because of the intensive mental application demanded of the student, but also of the danger of disturbing the usually somewhat irascible temperaments of the professors of this course.

If the subject-matter is appropriately distributed along the lines above indicated, it can be conveniently disposed of in two or three years. We have been frequently told that we should not crowd the minds of the students with names and dates, but that we should seek to trace the deeper reasons and causes of development and to let the student view the march of events from a philosophical standpoint. This is unquestionably true. At the same time it is well to bear in mind that the student must know names and dates and that the danger of overcrowding his memory is more or less remote. Therefore, "sit modus in rebus." While it is our duty to point out to him the wonderful ways of Divine Providence "quae attingit a fine usque ad finem fortiter, et disponit omnia suaviter," it is likewise our duty not to color facts unduly, but to let him see clearly and objectively both triumphs and failures. If this is done with tact and prudence he cannot

help but realize the truth of the saying: "Infirma mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat fortia."

We now turn to Patrology. The "studium Patrum" should retain its place of honor in the Franciscan schools, for its advantages are manifold. The lives and deeds, the very names of these pillars of orthodoxy serve to confirm a young man in his faith, not to speak of the spiritual and intellectual wealth contained in their writings. But of course, Patrology is incomplete without the reading of Patristic works. During the classical course there is neither time nor opportunity for this, but if we can prove to the professors of Philosophy the undeniable advantages that this exercise will yield towards the philosophical formation of the student, they will acknowledge our wisdom in assigning one or two hours a week for this purpose, at least for the first year. As we were discussing this matter in connection with the classical curriculum I observed that there was a strong tendency to devote this first year, which was formerly the year of Humanities, entirely to philosophy. While this seems to be a good move on the whole, it is well not to make the change too radical. As I remarked on that occasion, there is a distinct advantage in retaining the reading of the Classics, though in a limited degree, for the first year at least after the novitiate. After all the novitiate makes men out of our "Seraphic" boys. If they take up the Classics after this year of prayerful solitude, of sound reflection, interspersed with plenty of "sacristy Latin," they will be far better qualified and also better disposed to appreciate the real worth of the authors. This is the time to introduce them to the classical lore of Christian antiquity. We frequently find that in secular institutions selections from the Latin or Greek Fathers are given a prominent place in the syllabus. If our lectors would dust off some of the old tomes lined up under the Rubric "Sancti Patres" in the Monastery library they might find that Lactantius, Chrysostom and a score of other writers of the Patristic age may well compare with the pagan classics. We don't mean, however, that the latter should be excluded from these readings, but it would be desirable to choose apologetic and philosophical subjects. In this way the course would serve the three-fold purpose, of rounding out our classical studies, of sup-

plementing the study of philosophy and of initiating the student at least indirectly into the study of Fundamental theology. This together with a concise course of Patrology in the first year of theology will qualify the student for the practical use of the Fathers in the class of Homiletics.

The study of Christian Antiquities or Archaeology should be taken up in the first year of theology and may be combined with the history of the early Church. A general, though systematic, treatment of the subject is all that is necessary, for the doctrinal significance of individual facts and questions will have to be dealt with separately in Sacramental theology, Liturgy and other branches. With this course there should be associated the study of Christian Art and Architecture. If so frequently fault is found with our ecclesiastical architecture generally, because of the deplorable absence of real aesthetic work, we religious should lay a large share of the blame to ourselves. It is our duty to take the lead in this field, as did the monks of old, and we Franciscans in particular should perpetuate the noble efforts of our Spanish confrères, who have created along the Pacific coast a unique and the only genuine style of church architecture.

This last remark suggests another branch of history which was touched on at a previous session, viz.: the History of our Order. The words of Peter Manero of the seventeenth century, that the Order of Friars Minor "nescit publicare quae facit" have been verified down to our day and I do not see any reason why we should ask the Lord to change the Friar in this particular aspect. Yet, when ignorance tries to adorn and make a show of humility, it despoils it of both its merit and its charm. We should awaken and foster in our young men an interest and a love for all things Franciscan and we should not bear with any apathy or disinterestedness on this score. We owe this to our Order and we owe it to its future generations. The earnest study of Franciscan History will confirm the young in their holy vocation; it will give them a sane idealism and strength of will. It will teach them that scholarship and efficiency were always the companions of regular observance and sanctity, and that intellectual and literary lethargy always proved the surest symptoms of spiritual stagnancy. It will teach them to be justly proud of our Order, with-

out being conceited or exclusive; conservative, without being narrow-minded; self-confident and yet not haughty or overbearing. The immortal Luke Wadding has set us the example. The study should naturally begin in the novitiate, but since a comprehensive and scientific treatment can hardly be expected during this period, it devolves upon the lector of Church History to devote his attention to this work.

The first of the systematic sciences is Dogmatic theology. Its rise and most flourishing period is coincident with, and no doubt to a large extent traceable to, the rise and early growth of the Order of St. Francis. Franciscan theology, it is true, is the theology of the Church, yet it has a charm, a power and a significance all its own and it is difficult to point out on the mediaeval sky a constellation equal in brightness and power to that of our four great leaders; Master Alexander, the "monarcha theologorum"; his great disciple St. Bonaventure, the Prince of Mystics; John Duns Scotus, the "Doctor Marianus" and Roger Bacon, the marvel of his age. When meditating upon their work we are reminded of a magnificent Gothic cathedral with vast dimensions, rising to lofty heights and whose spires seem to reach into the very clouds of heaven. There at the foundations is Roger Bacon working away with pick and shovel. The perspiration falls from his brow and some hard sayings from his lips. And there is Master Alexander, holding in one hand the plan of the stately edifice and in the other the scale with which he measures the mighty walls and slender pillars. And there, close to the altar of the Eucharistic King, stands the Seraphic Doctor, wrapt in mystic thought while designing a fresco of his incomparable "Arbor Vitae." Last but not least we descry the Subtle Doctor standing on a lofty scaffold, busy with brush and chisel, drawing the lines finer and cutting the edges sharper and finally adorning the facade of the Gothic temple with the statue of "Maria Immaculata."

There is not to my knowledge a work which gives a satisfactory synthesis of our theology and traces the historic development of the Franciscan School. Such a work would be most desirable, and would serve as a guide no less than an inspiration to both pupils and lectors. If text-books and larger works on theology

fail to give adequate treatment to our school, it is our own fault. We have criticized and condemned others for slighting and slurring our Duns Scotus, but we forget that it was our duty to expound and defend the teaching of the Subtle Doctor and to bring out an edition of his works that would meet modern requirements. It is not purely for sentimental reasons that we should study Scotus. The Church has explicitly and repeatedly approved his teaching, and in numberless instances the "praxis Ecclesiae" as well as modern science and philosophy bear witness to the thoroughness, soundness and farsightedness of the Critic among the scholastics. It may be our misfortune, though I rather think it is our good fortune, that the Franciscan School lacks one great dominating leader whom all are compelled to follow, because of his authority. The fact that we have not one but several great leaders, all equally worthy of imitation, has imprinted upon the Franciscan School the marks of individuality, of originality, of fairness to all the Masters but unreserved submission to the Infallible Church alone and has aided in no small measure in broadening out and deepening the study of theology in the past.

It is along these lines that the lector of Dogmatic theology should train his class. Let him not waste time over trying to make Thomists or Scotists or Molinists out of his students, but let him teach them the theology of the Church on a broad basis. If they turn out to be Thomists, no harm will be done, and if Scotists, so much the better; but in principle I think the professor ought to be eclectic. A thorough training in scholastic theology is essential. It is the backbone. But positive theology should be accorded equal attention. The thirteenth century theologians fought their opponents on their own ground and with their own weapons. In like manner should we employ principles of sound criticism and history generously and fearlessly in the exposition and defense of the dogmas. These are cast out of strong material and such treatment will not harm them. The scholastic part should be treated in Latin, but purely positive matter can be elucidated and brought home to the student properly only in the vernacular.

Our "Ratio Studiorum" provides for one class of Dogma a day for four years; the first of which is reserved for Fundamental

Dogma or Apologetics. Excepting perhaps the fundamental outline of the *Loci theologici* this science should be thoroughly abreast of the times. In the past the Friars Minor have effectively acted the part of *Defensores Fidei* at the rise of practically every error and heresy. Their strenuous and frequently successful efforts to reconcile the Greeks, the Mohammedans and the Jews to the Church are a matter of history. Not so well known and not liberally admitted by historians are their unceasing labors for the purity of faith before and during the Protestant Reformation, but it is a fact that they have saved to the Church entire regions and countries of Europe. We may point with delight to the fearless John Capistran who traversed all of southern Europe as the "Malleator haereticorum"; to the dramatic denunciation of Henry VIII by the Vicar of Greenwich; to the remarkable words that Bernard Dappen wrote when no one suspected the danger of Luther's teaching: "Vere timeo et verissime teneo quod anguis lateat in herba." It was indeed a well-deserved distinction that the Order enjoyed in Papal Rome, viz.: of appointing one of its lectors to fill the chair of Fundamental Dogma at the Sapienza.

The courses of both Fundamental and Special Dogmatic theology should be supplemented by regular debates, and the former in particular by frequent exercises in writing and private reading. A Reference Library, including up-to-date apologetic works and Reviews, should be at the student's disposal. He must learn to form his own judgment on current topics and to give expression to his views in writing.

While Dogmatic theology has to do with the exposition and defence of the Deposit of Faith directly, the two sister sciences of Homiletics and Catechetics deal with the explanation of its contents to the flock and the lambs. In both fields our lectors can point out to their students great and shining models in our own Order. Diedrich Coelde's "Christenspiegel" ranks foremost in catechetical literature, and, like many similar works by Franciscan authors, enjoyed a marvelous popularity. Speaking of popularity we may safely say that our preachers of the past have been unequalled in this regard in practically all countries. Not to speak of the great luminaries, such as SS. Anthony, Bernardine of Siena, James of the Marshes and John Capistran, whose work

has practically speaking the solemn approval of the Church, I will only recall a few of the minor celebrities whom a devout public has adorned with most characteristic titles, such as Hugh de Digne, "the second St. Paul"; Bl. Albert of Sarteano, the "Rex Praedicatorum"; Theobald of Geislingen, "the Apostle of Austria"; St. Ladislaus, "the Sun of Poland"; Francis Panigorola, "the Christian Demosthenes" and the incomparable Berthold of Ratisbon, who was known as the "amicus Dei et hominum." No wonder that their work in Italy elicited from a chronicler the remark: "Eorum eloquentia, doctrina et sanctitate Italia commota fuit et in maxima devotione excitata."

Our duties in this field are clearly defined. James of Vitry referred to the Franciscans of his day simply as the "Ordo Praedicatorum quos Minores vocant." Our Seraphic Father lays down for us principles that cannot be improved upon. If we abide by his counsel and preach "vitia et virtutes, poenam et gloriam," we shall continue to support and rejoice the House of God. Beginning with the early years of our classical course we should cultivate in our students the art of eloquence and insist on this practice throughout their philosophical and theological studies. In theology both the theory and practice of the science of Homiletics must be given serious consideration. Catechetics may be reserved for the fourth year. It is important that all the lectors of theology co-operate with the lector of Homiletics in making the student see the practical side of all they learn, no matter in what branch of study, for sooner or later it will serve to enrich and strengthen their discourses and lend them that picturesqueness which has always proved a characteristic of Franciscan preaching.

As I have insinuated before, the indications are that the Order in this country is entering upon a new era. It is well, therefore, to organize our forces and to adopt a more definite plan of work than has heretofore been possible. Our missions, retreats and similar duties, in fact the "totum officium praedicandi" should be conducted on a more uniform plan. It seems that we are not profiting adequately by our own wealth and resources. Why go borrowing, if everything you need and more than you can handle is there, though perhaps stored away and covered with the dust

of many years? Let us copy the old models and render them into the language of the day, then we need not fear for the force and attractiveness that distinguished Franciscan preaching in the past. But to attain our purpose, it may be necessary to step beyond the ordinary curriculum and to put into operation the plan proposed in our "Ratio Studiorum" which provides for a year or two of "Sacra Eloquenteria" after the completion of theology. I suggest that we discuss the ways and means to this end at our next sectional meeting.

Though ranking in its theoretical aspect with Dogmatic theology, the study of Moral theology, as a practical science, is intimately associated with Homiletics, for the pulpit and the confessional must supplement each other. Our "Ratio Studiorum" makes ample provision for this study and we cannot complain, generally speaking, that it is neglected in our clerics. Our immediate duties and the spirit of this country, which naturally finds its way into our monasteries, account for this fact. I believe, too, that on the whole our lectors speak well of such authors as Sporer, Elbel, Oberrauch, Herincx, Van der Velden and other prominent Franciscan Moralists, and I am sure they will not take it amiss if I quote for their benefit what Chaucer said of the contemporary friar: "And sweet was his absolution." Casuistry is an integral part of Moral theology. The lector will find time and opportunity to conduct it both formally and informally. Following the example of Angelus of Clavasio and our other eminent casuists he should not overlook the really actual questions and difficulties that modern conditions bring before the priest. Likewise, he is to give an answer to the modern social problems, according to the time-tried principles of our theology, whenever the opportunity presents itself. This will forestall the necessity of burdening our theological curriculum with a special class in Sociology. The place for this is philosophy. The principles of Ascetical theology, too, should receive his attention, as I shall point out presently.

In the matter of Ascetical and Mystical theology I would call attention to the commonplace truth, that it is one thing to lecture on this subject for the sake of edification and another to lecture for the sake of instruction. If we confine ourselves to the former

method and reduce the entire subject to the heart-to-heart talks of a "saintly good man," as the saying is, we might indeed succeed in enriching, if everything goes well, the Calendar of Saints, but whether we would comply with the well-known decision of St. Theresa, and of perhaps a few other nuns, is quite another question. The whole field could indeed be left to the Spiritual Directors, but we realize that it is rather awkward to be asking questions in a spiritual conference and to ascertain whether the students have an objective and scientific knowledge and appreciation of the matter. At any rate, the lector of Moral theology frequently has opportunity of treating the main facts and principles, e. g., in the tract, "De Virtutibus"—and he should not neglect it.

And speaking of Spiritual Directors, might we not suggest to them the idea of coming together and deciding on a uniform, progressive plan of spiritual instruction which extends throughout the clericate? Would such a course not wonderfully aid to fortify our young men in exactly what St. Paul recommends to Titus, viz.: "in doctrina, in integritate, in gravitate"? Furthermore, we would like to see in the libraries of our Spiritual Directors more of those authors who lived prior to this and the last centuries and who have behind their names the three letters, O. F. M. The principles of Ascetical theology have not changed since the writing of the first book of the New Testament and the richest mines lie between that period and our modern booklets and pamphlets—many of them in our Seraphic garden, forlorn and forgotten. Let us hope that in the not distant future we may have in our hands such works as "The Golden Treatise, of Mental Prayer," by St. Peter of Alcantara and many others in a complete series, a "Literatura Franciscana Ascetica."

A few words on the sciences which we have grouped under Imperium Ecclesiae, viz., Canon Law and Pastoral theology, and the Ministerium, viz., S. Liturgy. The logical place for Pastoral theology is the fourth year of theology. For the study of Canon Law the new Code with its clearness, completeness and grand simplicity is of invaluable advantage. Its contents may be conveniently arranged and distributed through the four years so as to have the same subject treated conjointly in Canon Law and

Moral theology. S. Liturgy may be begun in the first or second year while the practical part, i. e., the Rubrics of the Ritual and Missal should be reserved for the two last years. When we remember what our forefathers have done for S. Liturgy—let me only mention the names of Haymo of Faversham, Quiñones, Ximenez, Thomas of Celano and John Pecham—and how they have enriched and adorned the House of God with the most beautiful devotions and pious practices, it should be an easy matter to inspire our students with a love for this subject. A true appreciation of both the historical and mystical significance of S. Liturgy will teach them to view it as a beautiful garland encircling the Tabernacle, wound together with the golden threads of Dogma, adorned with rarest flowers from S. Scripture and the Fathers and giving forth a sweet odor that should permeate the House of God through our homiletical, catechetical and ascetical instruction.

In speaking of the curriculum generally we shall be careful not to imitate Roger Bacon's famous treatise "De septem Peccatis Theologiae." Our purpose is to build up, but in so doing we should determine upon what our energies should be chiefly concentrated. A very common complaint is that the theological curriculum is overburdened, and yet if a single subject is taken out there will be a gap and a deficiency in our theological training. What we need in our day is a genius like Peter Lombard or Alexander or St. Thomas who will create, as Father David Fleming used to say, a new synthesis of theology. We shall probably not live to see this realized, except perhaps in a relative sense, and even then not without the sanction from higher quarters. But it should not be very difficult for the lectors of a province, especially when they live in the same house of studies, to contribute materially by mutual exchange of views towards a satisfactory solution of this problem. At the Catholic Educational Conference of 1913 a paper by Dr. H. Heuser was read which, I am confident, will serve as a most valuable guide in this matter. The distinguished scholar summarizes his suggestions under three heads: 1) Eliminate repetitions; 2) Eliminate the superfluous; 3) Co-ordinate the subject matter. Naturally, some will be inclined to reject the first point "a priori," because of the accepted principle "Repetitio est mater studiorum." Of course, it would

be foolish to underrate the value of repetition in our studies, but when the same subject is repeated over and over again under different aspects, with different definitions, different terminology, new divisions and sub-divisions, we have reason to fear that the issue will be beclouded rather than clarified. It is like sharpening a good blade too often and with too many different instruments. Others will take exception to the second point and will tell us that nothing is superfluous in the sacred science of theology over which the Church watches with the utmost solicitude. It is true that this point may open the way for subjective opinions, but the outstanding fact is that many questions in theology have a purely historic interest and that there are many others with which the "vivum magisterium Ecclesiae" is directly concerned. If the former are disposed of briefly and historically, there will be more time for treating the latter more thoroughly. The two chief hindrances in the way of the process of elimination are our text-books and some of our professors who labor under the impression that unless they treat every single question "a summo coelorum usqua ad terminos eorum," nobody else will because, in parentheses, nobody else can. Both these hindrances will be easily overcome if the lectors come to a clear understanding among themselves. Let us hope that our future Conferences will bring this about as far as possible.

If the process of elimination has been successfully carried out, it will not be a difficult matter to co-ordinate the different branches and subjects. Speaking generally our four years of theology resolve themselves naturally into three distinct parts, the first year, the second and third combined, and the fourth year. In most branches these three sections should be taught separately, though in certain general classes or lectures two or all sections may be combined.

The first year deals mainly with the "Fundamentalia" in practically all the branches, especially in Dogmatic and Moral theology. The study of Apologetics receives an added force and significance through its intimate association with the History of Dogma, Patrology, Christian Antiquities and Introduction to S. Scripture. Thus the treatment of the whole subject matter is on the whole apologetical, historical and theoretical. It is the

year of Propædeutics. In the second and third years we approach the body of theology proper, viz., Exegesis of selected books or groups of books, the cardinal dogmas, the main tracts of Moral theology, etc. For the fourth year we may reserve such subjects as have an immediate practical use, e. g., the Sacraments in both Dogma and Moral, Casuistry and Pastoral theology. The textbook should frequently yield its place to the Missal, the Ritual, the Catechism, the Sunday Gospels and Epistles. After fixing the general outline, a more intimate association of correlative tracts and topics may be secured. This procedure should start with Dogmatic and Moral theology as the proper nucleus. After correlating these two branches we may proceed to bring into harmony with Dogmatic theology, on the one hand, the study of Exegesis, Homiletics, Liturgy and even Church History, and on the other, with Moral theology the study of Canon Law and the other practical studies.

Viewing the entire field of theological studies from a pedagogical standpoint we may be prompted to ask ourselves, not only whether our curriculum affords the students the best opportunity of learning their theology, but also whether it is apt to train all their faculties, and, what it contributes towards their priestly formation? This will depend entirely upon the practical side of our methods, which is after all the most telling part of our teaching, and it is the duty of the Prefect of Studies to work out this question synthetically in order that the best results may be obtained. Herein, too, we may well be guided by the saying: *Sacerdos est alter Christus.* In the class of practical liturgy or Rubrics the future priest should be taught to acquire that decorum which becomes the House of God and his sacred functions. In the regular debates he receives an excellent mental training. For Dogmatic theology the "forma scholastica" in Latin should be retained; for apologetic, scriptural and historical subjects the parliamentary form is preferable. The practical work in casuistry is designed to sharpen his judgment, while the conferences in Pastoral theology tend to regulate his dealing with the outside world. The weekly sermons, which according to a time-honored custom should be held "coram communitate," are an excellent preparation for the pulpit. But if we are bound to

devote our first attention to the "ars dicendi," we should not leave the "ars scribendi" far behind. The times require it. The lectors of the historical sciences have here a large field for cultivation. The culmination, however, of all our practical exercises is the Seminar. If this is properly conducted we shall silence the complaint that the more talented students have not enough to do. Let us assign them questions or topics for serious research which, apart from its possible intrinsic worth, will be the best remote preparation for the lectorate or higher studies.

DISCUSSION.

FR. GEORGE:—With regard to the addition of a special year of Sacred Eloquence to the course of Theology, I believe that we ought to be guided by the directions given in our Constit. Gen. No. 255. It is

Special Year in true, this article does not contain a precept but a recommendation. This recommendation, however, is an earnest one, because the reasons for **Sacred Eloquence.** making it are weighty ones. "Cum uberiori sacrae Eloquentiae studium pro munere Praedicatorum et Missionarium magni sit momenti" the text says; the importance of this study for the exercise of the sacred office of Preaching, then, is the reason why the recommendation is made. What importance is to be attached to the worthy and effective exercise of the office of preaching the Church has officially told us time and again. The Encyclical of the present Holy Father Benedict XV. on Preaching, issued 15 June, 1917, and the Normae pro Sacra Praedicatione of the S. Congreg. Consist. published June 29, 1917 (Act. Apost. S. vol. 9 no. 7) are the latest pronouncements of Holy Church on this matter. These documents, which deserve to be studied by every priest, must impress deeply upon every thinking mind, what the Church wishes to be done by her consecrated ministers in this matter. They show clearly that things are not everywhere as they should be, that there is need of reform or at least of improvement in the exercise of this priestly function. Is our country exempt from this need? The recent discussions in the *Ecclesiastical Review* on "The Lost Art of Preaching" make it clear to every unbiased mind that, to say the least, also with us there is room for great improvement in the manner of discharging this sacred duty.

Is the preaching of the Franciscans in the United States perhaps beyond criticism and in every respect up to the correct standards of Sacred Eloquence? While I readily acknowledge that our preaching, generally speaking, is not inferior to that of other priests, while I give full credit to the excellent work done in this line by some of the members

of our Order, it would be folly to shut our eyes to the defects, at times not little indeed, that may be observed in the work of the average Franciscan preachers. Vain self-satisfaction is the deadly foe of all progress in every field of human endeavor. With us, too, there is need of improvement, if we wish to come up to the wishes and expectations of Holy Church to the best of our ability.

Moreover, let us not forget, that Preaching the Word of God has been that sphere of priestly labor in which our Order has distinguished itself in a special manner in the past. The history and the traditions of the Order fully bear out this assertion. Faithful to these traditions, our aim should be to attain at least some degree of excellence in this sacred art. To excuse our shortcomings by the hollow plea, "we are not worse than the rest" is utterly unworthy of brethren and followers of such men like St. Bernardine, St. Leonard, or Berthold of Regensburg. Indolence, lack of energy on our part in this noble and important work deserves no credit but blame in the sight of God and His Saints as well as in the sight of Holy Church, whose favored ministers and zealous helpers the Friars Minor have always been and always ought to be.

Earnestly wishing that the Friars Minor remain faithful to the best traditions of the past and distinguish themselves as worthy and effective preachers of the Word of God, the Constitutions say "commendatur ut juniores Sacerdotes, emenso S. Theologiae curriculo per unum vel duos annos adhuc sacrae Eloquentiae theoretice et practice plenius addiscendae addicantur." The reason why another year is to be set apart for the study of sacred eloquence is because during the four years of theology full justice cannot well be done to this study. The other branches of study take up so much of the time that not much remains for the study of S. Eloquence. To remedy this defect another year should be set apart for this study, during which our young priests may find ample time for a good and thorough preparation for the ministry of the word.

Realizing the wisdom of this recommendation, a number of provinces of the Order in Europe and in Canada have introduced this year of S. Eloquence. Their example deserves to be imitated. If they can do it, why should not the Friars in the United States also be able to do it? As I have already said before, the Constitutions do not impose an obligation in this case. This, however, is no reason to leave this article altogether unheeded. It is the part of a wise lawgiver to be slow in formulating precepts, because the necessity of dispensation and the danger of transgression are evils to be dreaded. It is the part of obedient religious not only to carry out precepts but also to heed with whole-hearted attention, to follow with reverent and ready submission the earnest recommendations and wise directions of their Constitutions, especially if they touch a matter of such vital importance as the one under consideration. I know well enough, that actual circumstances may make it very difficult in some provinces to add another year for the study of S. Eloquence. In

such cases no one will reasonably blame them for this omission. It is one thing, however, to yield to the pressure of stubborn circumstances, quite another to be opposed a priori to the addition of this year of study and then search out some flimsy excuse in unfavorable circumstances or to let the imagination magnify difficulties and make oneself believe that the thing is impossible. Where there is a will there is a way. If we have an earnest will we can get over many difficulties, and what at first seemed impossible can be gradually made possible. Neither can we afford to ignore altogether this wise recommendation and act as if it did not exist. It is evident, then, that the proper attitude to be taken in this matter is to aim at making the addition of this year of study of S. Eloquence possible in all provinces.

As to our province, I believe, that here in St. Louis, where hitherto the "sacerdotes simplices" have been necessary for the celebration of Mass in the various institutions in charge of the Fathers, this same work could be done by young priests who, after finishing their regular course of theology, are devoting their time to the study of S. Eloquence. This change could be made gradually so as to reduce the difficulties connected with almost every change, to a minimum.

To sum up, the effective and worthy exercise of the office of Preaching is of vital importance to the Church of God and hence demands a thorough preparation and adequate training of the future preacher. During the four years of theology this training can hardly be given. Our Constitutions suggest as an efficacious means to attain the end in view, the special study of S. Eloquence after completing the regular course of theology for at least one year. Therefore, I hold that this Conference should recommend the introduction of this year of S. Eloquence to the Provinces, in order to give our sacerdotes juniores ample opportunity to become "operarii inconfusibiles recte tractantes verbum veritatis" (2 Tim. 2, 15.)

FR. PROVINCIAL:—My reasons for a special year of Sacred Eloquence after the completion of Theology are:

- 1) The General Constitutions recommend it, as being of great importance for our Preachers and Missionaries.
- 2) The best Provinces in the Order have introduced it; the small Province of Canada assigned even two years to the study of Sacred Eloquence.
- 3) Dogma, Moral, Exegesis, and other allied studies to which the Theologians must give their full attention, take so much of their time that, comparatively speaking, little time remains for Sacred Eloquence. Naturally, then, it is considered as a subordinate science of minor importance.
- 4) Since in our Province all the classes are combined in the study of Sacred Eloquence, the theologian will get a chance to preach a trial ser-

mon only once or twice in the course of one year, which is certainly not sufficient. To let them preach outside of the regular school-hours would still add to the over-burdened course with all its hard studies.

5) Moreover, as only one hour a week was set apart for Sacred Eloquence, during which time a sermon is first preached in the church, then, criticized and corrected in the class-room, only little time remains for a real and thorough course of Sacred Eloquence.

6) We find that in many cases our young priests, after completing their Theology, are not properly prepared and not really fitted for preaching. Some of them are made assistants in large parishes, where they must preach every Sunday, sometimes more than once, and they find it very hard to give satisfaction to the people or to themselves. Besides, there is so much other work to be done that they often lack the time for the necessary preparation. Other young priests are sent to take care of Stations and Missions, where their preaching can not be observed or corrected by their fellow-priests.

7) But if, after the completion of Theology, the young Fathers get one year which is entirely devoted to Sacred Eloquence, there will be only one course of students and each student will make and deliver a well-prepared sermon every week. The teacher will also have ample time to give individual instruction to each student. Thus, at the end of the year, every student will have about forty well-prepared sermons on the most necessary subjects. The afternoon could be well used in training the students in preparing and giving addresses on the great questions of our time. The social questions of our day could be thoroughly discussed, for which there is not sufficient time in Theology.

8) Besides, the best manner of giving Missions and Retreats (according to the old Franciscan way), could be explained as it is done in the Apostolic College in Washington, D. C. Also, the peculiar aims and needs of our Catholic Societies and special addresses for them could be treated.

9) Formerly, some Fathers strongly advocated a year of Rhetoric after the Novitiate. But I think that it is far better to join this course of higher Rhetoric with Sacred Eloquence after the completion of Theology, because the students are then better fitted and can draw for their subjects from the entire field of Philosophy and Theology and prepare lectures which are of real practical use for them in their future field of labor.

FR. MARTIN:—As to the question whether a year of Sacred Eloquence should be added to the course of Theology, I beg to say that I am heartily in favor of it. The principal reason is number 255 of our General Constitutions, which recommends one or even two years of Sacred Eloquence. This alone would be sufficient reason for introducing that extra year.

This recommendation is confirmed by the commonly admitted fact 1) that Sacred Eloquence does not receive enough attention during the theo-

logical course, and 2) that, nevertheless, all our priests are called upon to use Sacred Eloquence very extensively for the rest of their life. They cannot be too well prepared for this important office.

The extra year could well be utilized in giving the young priests some good directions regarding missions, retreats, triduums, lectures, etc., a thing which is wholly neglected now. If it is advisable, or even necessary, to instruct theologians how to handle certain classes of penitents, how to administer the sacraments, how to manage a parish, etc., will it be less useful or necessary to instruct them on the afore-mentioned subjects?

This extra year, coming as it does after the ordination to the priesthood, could well take the place of the "simplex year," which, in our Province at least, for many years was considered a good way to introduce the young priests gradually into their various priestly functions. The services of these young priests would also be very opportune if the study house were located in a large city, as we have amply experienced in St. Louis.

FR. HUGH:—The fifth year of Theology, or the special course in Sacred Eloquence, is recommended in the General Statutes; hence I give it my unqualified approval and I wish to see it adopted in all Provinces, wherever it is practical and possible. Owing to the many deaths in our Province during the last year, I know it will be impossible to do so in our Province for some years to come.

We need trained missionaries and retreat-masters in this country more than ever. In order to be effective, I would require that this course be devoted almost exclusively to the writing and studying of sermons for Missions, Triduums, Retreats, Forty Hours, and for special occasions. It is for such sermons that we have a special need. For ordinary sermons and catechetical instructions the young priest will find ample time to prepare. Experience teaches that it is precisely for such extraordinary sermons that time and experience is lacking in our young priests. Let the course be a thorough one under the direction of an experienced missionary and retreat-master.

FR. ERMIN:—Setting aside the first year after ordination for a special course in Sacred Eloquence is, I think, truly a step in the right direction. As I understand the suggestion, this course would be entirely distinct from the so-called missionary course, which might be given later to such priests as give evidence of possessing real missionary qualifications. The course here in question would aim to combine actual preaching with proper guidance and constructive criticism; and such a year of eminently practical opportunities would indeed be a fitting climax to the entire seminary curriculum, throughout which the ministry of preaching was ever the ideal that like a guiding star shed its peculiar light on every branch of study.

This suggestion brings to mind also the very important consideration that during the first year after ordination the priestly habits and practices are in the process of formation. Much might be said in this connection, but let us confine ourselves to the original point of view. We are speaking of a post-graduate course in Sacred Eloquence.

“Poeta nascitur, orator fit.” Here and there we may speak of a born orator, but this exception goes to prove the rule that the orator is made. And usually he is a long time in the making. It were a fatal fallacy to imagine that this year of Sacred Eloquence is, all of itself, to produce effective pulpit orators. In fact, this year may become a disgusting failure unless it can build upon a foundation carefully and systematically laid during the entire preceding curriculum. This year is not to be a course in Elocution, nor in Rhetoric, nor even in Eloquence simply; it will touch upon these things in as far as it builds upon them, but its scope is infinitely broader.

The young priest has presumably mastered the fundamentals of articulation and pronunciation, inflection and modulation; he has learned how to use his voice and knows its compass; he distinguishes tone-quality, pitch, force and speed; the secret of poise and carriage is no secret to him; he appreciates the expressive power and consequent value of well-made gestures, and has acquired a certain facility of “action”; he recognizes the necessity of facial expression, and feels the eloquence of the deliberate pause;—in short, his elocutionary training, we presume, is finished. Furthermore, he has had a course in Composition and Rhetoric: the rhetorical essentials of unity, coherence and emphasis, as well as the principles governing the various form of discourse, are well known to him and fairly well applied. He has learned how to approach a given theme, and the disposition of subject-matter presents no peculiar difficulties to his mind. He has a practical working knowledge of style. Philosophy has taught him to be logical; Theology has supplied his topics, the eternal truths as presented by the infallible authority of the Church; in fact, he has written and delivered some quite acceptable sermons even before his ordination. Now, what is still wanting?

We, who can recall the experience of our first year in the ministry, know the answer only too well. Our student is now a priest, and he wants a priestly mind. He wants a knowledge of men. He wants that intimate acquaintance with men’s hearts and minds which the experience of the confessional alone can give; and with this priestly knowledge he wants to preach the Word of God frequently. But he also wants time to prepare these sermons carefully—time to study his topic, time to write and rewrite the sermon, time to memorize it, time to practice its delivery. He wants the helpful suggestion and paternal guidance of a teacher who can speak from experience. He wants a competent critic to pass judgment on every feature of his oratorical efforts before he ascends the pulpit, and he wants an unprejudiced opinion of the impressions that he

leaves on his audience. All these wants, I believe, can be adequately supplied by the special year of Sacred Eloquence that we have in mind.

I would not presume to outline a definite plan of study here, but I venture to suggest a few points which to my mind appear as fundamental requirements. The home for this course of study should be in a large city, where we have a monastery and where the services of the Friars are constantly in demand. The student-priest should have the "cura animarum" without regular parish work. He should, if possible, have occasion to hear confessions on Saturday and to preach a short sermon on Sunday, but for the rest of the week he should be a student at home. One daily period should suffice for class-work, individual coaching being an essential feature of the course.

But where shall he find the teachers for this eminently practical course? If this question really points to a serious difficulty, we might meet the problem with concerted, inter-provincial action. However, I think every Province has men quite capable of conducting such a class with gratifying results. There is no university course to prepare the teacher as we desire him here. I would not look for a school-man or an elocutionist. But give us a man of broad, practical experience—say a missioner who has learned to feel the pulse of the people—and ordinarily we shall find combined in him also those qualities and abilities that will make him a successful teacher of our aspiring pulpit orators.

Conceding that we may not realize the ideal at once should not deter us from attempting at least what is possible. A most encouraging feature in the present discussion is the apparent unanimity with which this Conference endorses the proposal. May we not conclude that this unanimity reflects the general opinion in our Provinces; and may we not hope, therefore, that, in spite of anticipated difficulties, we shall soon welcome the introduction of this much desired course?

FR. FERDINAND:—Objections have been made to the introduction into the curriculum of an additional year or two of Sacred Eloquence on the grounds that present conditions are unfavorable. It is urged, in the first place, that it would be difficult to find competent teachers for this course. But the same difficulty exists with regard to every branch in the curriculum, yet who would think of closing our seminaries and houses of studies on that account? It is said there is in all the provinces a dearth of priests, and that the young Fathers could not be spared for a special course in Sacred Eloquence. But there is nothing to prevent these Fathers from engaging in pastoral work. Only give them time for their studies. Again, we are told that not all the young priests would profit by such a course. But, certainly, in every class there will be found a goodly number of young Fathers who are able and willing to benefit by a systematic study of this branch. Moreover, what is impossible for one single province can be achieved by the co-operation of all the provinces. A

general study house of Sacred Eloquence for all the provinces is well within the range of possibility; while an exchange of professors for certain studies, such as sociology, is a desirability. So much is certain, however, if we wait with the introduction of this branch till conditions become ideal, we shall have to wait till doomsday. No, let us rather begin at once with such men and means as are now at our disposal. A beginning, no matter how poor, is better than none at all. But let us not be extravagant either in our demands or in our expectations. If we are willing to wait for results, while we endeavor to improve conditions, we shall not be disappointed.

FR. URBAN:—I am heartily in favor of a special year for the exclusive study of Sacred Eloquence. The ministry of preaching is the chief work of the Friars and, therefore, we must devote extraordinary care and diligence to the study of Homiletics. There are difficulties, such as the shortage of men, in the way of the plan; but let us accept it as soon as possible, and thus secure for the Friars of today a position of honor as “praedicatorum Verbi Dei.” I would like to add that, while I fully endorse the splendid suggestions that have been made with reference to this special year of Sacred Eloquence, I do not concur in the opinion that, in consequence of such a course, the study of Elocution and Sacred Eloquence need not be pursued with much care during the preceding years. On the contrary, I hold that every department, classical, philosophical and theological, must contribute consistently and constructively towards the development of the future Franciscan preacher. The course should begin at College with a thorough instruction in elocution and composition; it should be continued in the classes of Rhetoric and Sacred Eloquence in the philosophical and theological departments, and should find its culmination in the special class of Sacred Eloquence. If we carry out this plan consistently we shall soon have preachers after the model of the once great Franciscan School of Preachers.

FR. CLAUDE:—The cry has been raised that we ought to be more zealous in the publication and dissemination of Franciscan ascetical literature. I would like to add that the ascetical instruction of our clerics would also be greatly improved by a little more co-ordination in imparting such instruction.

Our clerics generally reside in different monasteries, 3, 4, sometimes 5, and have a corresponding number of Masters. Each Master, however, is independent in the matter of Ascetics, and the result is that **Ascetics**, the clerics receive the same general instructions repeated with each change of Masters without order and without thoroughness.

Now, this could be remedied, if a system or plan could be devised, whereby the whole of Ascetical Theology could be covered once, or, at

most, twice during the 8 years of clerical life. This would make Ascetics more interesting and profitable for the clerics, and give them a better grasp of the subject, besides imbuing the Masters with greater assurance and more responsibility in the preparation of their matter.

FR. PETER:—Regarding the advisability of sending some of our younger Fathers who are qualified to teach in our seminaries and houses of studies to various educational institutions, I would say that I am heart and soul for this plan.

I sincerely hope that the Very Rev. Provincials will see their way clear **Specialization.** to send our promising young men to good universities, where they can continue their studies and, in accord with the admonition of St. Francis, advance simultaneously in science and in virtue. I would entreat the Very Rev. Provincials to begin at once with the realization of this plan.

RESOLUTIONS

Adopted by the Franciscan Educational Conference,

St. Louis, Mo., JUNE 30, JULY 1 and 2, 1919.

In submitting to the Very Rev. Provincials and Commissaries the following resolutions and recommendations for educational reconstruction, the members of this Conference desire to express their sincere gratitude and appreciation to the Provincial Superiors for the unusual educational opportunities accorded to all its members during the three full days of fruitful thought and discussion.

It is the sense of our meeting that an expression of warm gratitude is also due to the Rev. Fr. Guardian and all the Friars of St. Anthony Monastery for their generous hospitality; and to the Friars of the various Provinces for their habitual interest in our work and for their kind encouragement.

To the Most Rev. Albert T. Daeger, O. F. M., D. D., Archbishop of Santa Fe, this Conference returns sincere thanks for his whole-hearted greetings and special blessing.

Classical Department.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the members of the Franciscan Educational Conference in general assembly:

- 1) That henceforth the word "Seminary" should be substituted for that of "College" in the designation of our classical schools.
- 2) That the Seminary Curriculum should embrace 32 weekly periods.
- 3) That this Conference again records its insistence upon a thorough classical course, both in Latin and in Greek, as an essential requisite for time-honored Franciscan scholarship and for the pursuit of the higher studies.
- 4) That one weekly period each of elocution and vocal music should be made a part of the regular curriculum.
- 5) That the curriculum should provide for two periods of natural sciences throughout the entire course; and that it should embrace the study of elementary (descriptive) Botany and Zoology (Physical Geography, if desirable) and of Physics.
- 6) That the question of how many periods should be allotted to the study of modern language must be determined by each Province according to its own individual needs.
- 7) That, while it is the custom in the Novitiate to teach Franciscan History systematically, the Professor of History in the Seminary must not fail to emphasize Franciscan topics whenever opportunity presents itself.

- 8) That a thorough grammar school course of six years should be sufficient to meet the entrance requirements of our Seminaries.
- 9) That, whenever it is possible to secure the boys after such an elementary course, the Seminary course should extend over six years; and that where a six-year classical course is already in operation it should be retained.
- 10) That the preparatory Seminaries should be empowered to award to deserving students a diploma or certificate of proficiency leading up to academic degrees.
- 11) That the following plan indicating the various branches of study and the number of periods assigned to each branch is unanimously recommended by the Conference:

Religion	2	Mathematics	4
Latin	8	History	2
Greek	4	Sciences	2
English	6	Elocution	1
Modern Language.....	2	Music	1

Philosophical Department.

Regarding the study of Philosophy the Conference holds:

- 1) That this course should last three years of sixteen periods a week.
- 2) That for the present the old or synthetic method should be followed, and that, as to the language in which the instruction is imparted, a judicious combination of Latin and English is desirable.
- 3) That, in as much as our own Scotistic School does not receive just and due consideration in the current manuals of Philosophy, the lector should present fully the views of our own Franciscan School.
- 4) That the following Natural Sciences should be taught in connection with Philosophy: Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy, Biology and Physiology.
- 5) That the Sciences shall be regarded as subsidiary to Philosophy.
- 6) That the course of Philosophy shall also include Latin and Greek (Patristic and New Testament Readings), Hebrew, Rhetoric, Academia or Debating Society, and Chant.

The following plan is approved: Another tentative plan:

1st year:	1st year:
Logic and Ontology.....	6
Seminar	1
Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy	5
Latin and Greek.....	2
Rhetoric	1
Chant	1.
	Logic
	Sciences
	Latin and Greek.....
	Rhetoric
	Chant

2nd year:

Cosmology and Psychology....	6
Seminar	1
Biology and Physiology.....	5
Hebrew	2
Rhetoric	1
Chant	1

2nd year:

Metaphysics, Cosmology and Psychology	11
Seminar	1
Hebrew	2
Rhetoric	1
Chant	1

3rd year:

Theodicy and Ethics.....	6
History of Philosophy.....	4
Seminar	1
Sociology and Political Economy	1
Hebrew	2
Rhetoric	1
Chant	1

3rd year:

Theodicy and Ethics.....	6
History of Philosophy.....	4
Seminar	1
Sociology and Political Economy	1
Hebrew	2
Rhetoric	1
Chant	1

Theological Department.

1) With regard to the four years' course of Theology prescribed by the Codex Juris Can. (c. 1365) and the Const. Generales no. 254 the theological department of this Conference unanimously agreed that

a) The first year, embracing the fundamentals in all theological branches, should be taught separately.

b) That the subject-matter for the second and third course may be taught in combined classes in alternate years.

c) That the fourth course, which is of a distinctly practical nature, should be taken separately.

2) That twenty weekly periods should constitute the class-work of the first three years; and that a period should last, as a rule, one full hour. In the fourth year only sixteen hours' class-work are assigned to each week in order to enable the students to repeat privately the entire matter of Dogmatic and Moral Theology in preparation for the so-called Cura-examen to be made at the end of the fourth year.

3) That, whilst the following plan presents a suitable division of the whole subject-matter of Theology together with the number of periods to be assigned to each branch during the four years, yet the Conference recommends that sufficient latitude in the distribution and co-ordination of the subject-matter according to the needs and conditions of each Province should be allowed. This adaptation should be agreed upon by the lectors of the Province.

I. Annus (separatim docendus).

S. Scriptura.....	3	De Textibus, Versionibus, Canone, Historia et Geographia Biblica—Archaeologia.
Theol. Dogmat.....	6	Tractatus de Religione, Revelatione, Ecclesia, Scriptura, Traditione, Fide.
Theol. Mor. et Jus, cum disceptatione Casuum	5	a) Ex Theol. Mor.: Tract. de Actibus Humanis, Conscientia, Legibus, Peccatis, Virtutibus Theol.; Praeceptis Decalogi I, II, III, IV, V, VIII. b) Ex Codice Juris Can.: Can. 1-107 (Normae Generales) 726-730 (Simonia) 1255-1264 (Cultus Divinus) 1276-1289 (Reliquiae) 1307-1321 (Votum et Juram.) 1322-1326 (Fides) 1372-1374 (Educatio.)
Historia Eccles....	2	Antiquitas Christiana.
Patrologia	1	Vitae et Opera Patrum; Historia Dogmatum.
Homiletica	2	Praecepta Rhetoricae Sacrae—Praxis.
Cantus Sacer.....	1	
	—	
	20	(Circulus Litterarius—tempore libero.)

II et III. Annus (per turnum tradendi).**A) Materia *unius anni*.**

S. Scriptura.....	4	Introd. Specialis in Vet. Test.—Exegesis in locos selectos librorum Genes. Psalm. Vaticin. etc.
Theol. Dogmat....	5	Tract. de Deo Uno, Trino, Creante, Elevante, de Novissimis.
Theol. Mor. et Jus, cum Discept. Casuum	1	a) Ex Theol. Mor.: Tract. de Jure et Justitia; Contractibus; Praeceptis Ecclesiae; Praeceptis (statuum) particularibus. b) Ex Codice Juris Can.: Can. 108-725 (Clerici, Religiosi, Laici) 1203-1254 (Sepult. Dies Festi, Jejunium) 1384-1408 (Prohibitio Libr., Prof. Fidei) 1409-1551) (Summarie: Beneficia, Bona Temporalia).
Historia Eccles....	2	Medium Aevum.
Homiletica	1	Seminarium Homileticum.
S. Liturgia.....	1	Notiones liturg., Expositio historica, Caeremoniae Generales.
Cantus Sacer.....	1	
	—	
	20	(Circulus Litterarius—tempore libero).

B) Materia alterius anni.

S. Scriptura.....	4	Introd. Specialis in Evangelia et in Epist. Cath. et Apoc.; et Exegesis in partes selectas.
Theol. Dogmat....	5	Tract. de Deo Redemptore, Gratia, Sacramentis in Gen.
Theol. Mor. et Jus, cum Discept.	5	a) Ex Theol. Mor.: Tract. de Sacramentis in genere; de Sacramentis Bapt., Conf., Euch., Poen., Ext. Unct., Ord.; de Sacramentalibus; de Indulgentiis; de Irregularitatibus.
Casuum	1	b) Ex Codice Juris Can.: Can. 731-1011 (Sacra- menta, Indulg., Irregul.) 1144-1153 (Sacra- mentalia); 1154-1202 (Ecclesiae, Oratoria, Altaria) 1265-1275 (de Cultu Euchar.) 1290-1306 (Pro- cessiones, Supellex S.) 1327-1372; 1375-1383 (Praedicatio, Scholae, Seminaria).
Historia Eccles....	2	Aetas Recentior.
Homiletica	1	Seminarium Homileticum.
S. Liturgia.....	1	Notiones liturg.; Expositio historica; Caeremoniae Generales.
Cantus Sacer.....	1	
	—	
	20	(Circulus Litterarius—tempore libero).

IV. Annus (separatim docendus).

S. Scriptura.....	3	Introd. Spec. et Exegesis in Actus Apost. et Epistolas S. Pauli.
Theol. Dogmat....	4	Tract. de Sacramentis in Specie.
Theol. Mor. et Jus, cum Pastorali....	5	a) Ex Theol. Mor.: De Matrimonio; de VI Praecepto, de Delictis et Poenis.
	—	b) Ex Codice Juris Can.: Can. 1012-1143 (Matrim.) 1552-2142 (Summarie: Processus) 2142-2194 (Amotio Parochorum) 2195-2414 (de Delictis et Poenis).
Discept Casuum... 1		
Homiletica et Catehetica	1	Seminarium Homil.; Theoria Catech.; Exercitia Catech.
S. Liturgia.....	2	Rubricae Missalis, Ritualis, Caeremonialis Rom. Seraph.
	—	
	16	(Cantus Sacer—tempore libero).
		(Circulus Litter—tempore libero).

4) Since the "Praedicatio Verbi Dei" is the chief work of the Friars, especially in this country, the Conference earnestly recommends that great care and diligence be devoted to the study of Homiletics throughout the theological course. Both theory and practice (composition and delivery

of discourses) should receive special attention. The general class-work should be supplemented by individual training in composition and delivery.

5) The Conference heartily recommends that, in accordance with no. 255 Const. Gen. and the laudable practice obtaining in a number of Provinces of the Order, after the completion of the theological course, one year be set aside for the Studium S. Eloqueitiae under the direction of a competent and efficient teacher. This course should be essentially practical. Besides one daily instruction and the composition of the ordinary sermons, much time should be devoted to the preparation of discourses for triduums, lent, and especially for retreats and missions. The subject-matter should include apologetical, ascetical and also sociological topics. In default of suitable equipment and personnel, mutual co-operation will enable the various Provinces to bring about this much desired end.

6) Realizing the great importance of the social problems confronting the world today the Conference, mindful of Franciscan traditions and ideals, emphasizes the paramount necessity of a special study of these questions. Though sociology proper is taught in the department of philosophy, the lector of moral theology in particular should not fail opportunely to supplement his course with a suitable treatment of these questions.

7) The principles of Ascetical Theology should receive due attention in Moral Theology, particularly in the Tract. de Virtutibus. Furthermore, the Conference believes that, if the ascetical training of our Clerics does not come up to the expectations of our Rev. Spiritual Directors, this is largely due to the absence of system. Hence the Conference suggests that a uniform and progressive plan of ascetical instruction according to the principles of the Franciscan school be agreed upon by the Directors. In this connection the Conference urgently recommends the translation and publication of the many hidden gems of Franciscan ascetical literature which at present fail to receive that notice and appreciation which they justly deserve.

General Resolutions.

1) Whilst the Conference advocates a scientific and central control over our libraries in general with a view to ascertain the nature and typographical data of the many precious volumes of ascetical, homiletical, philosophical and theological literature which lie stored away in our own monasteries, it also recommends that in all houses of study the libraries of each Province correspond particularly to the requirements of the studies there pursued, and that the laboratories necessary for the study of science be as complete as possible.

2) The Conference again unanimously emphasizes the absolute necessity of uninterrupted particular attention to the "ars bene dicendi et scribendi" not only in the regular classes of Elocution, Homiletics, or in the debating society, but in every branch of study.

3) The Conference recommends to the consideration of the Provincial Superiors the affiliation of our Seminary Departments (Theology) with the Catholic University; the affiliation of our College Departments (Philosophy) with the Catholic University or some State University; and the affiliation of the Franciscan Educational Conference with the Catholic Educational Association.

4) In conclusion, the Conference again emphasizes the necessity of specialization which is deemed indispensable for successful teaching not only in the departments of philosophy and theology, but also in the classical department. Wherefore the Conference humbly begs the Provincial Superiors to accord our young men who have shown themselves to be qualified such opportunities of special training as will enable them to teach with true devotedness and efficiency.

Respectfully submitted by the Committee on Resolutions.

REV. THOMAS PLASSMAN, O. F. M., *Chairman.*
REV. PHILIP MARKE, O. F. M.
REV. GEORGE WETENKAMP, O. F. M.
REV. PAMPHILUS STAHL, O. F. M.
REV. URBAN FREUNDT, O. F. M., *Secretary.*

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
Franciscan Educational Conference.

Adopted at the final meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference,
St. Louis, Mo., July 2, 1919.

ARTICLE I.

NAME AND OBJECT.

SECTION 1. The name of this organization shall be: "The Franciscan Educational Conference."

SECTION 2. The general object of this Conference shall be to safeguard the principles and to promote the interests of Catholic Education.

SECTION 3. The particular object shall be:

a) To encourage the spirit of mutual helpfulness and co-operation among the Friar educators of the American Franciscan provinces:

b) To advance by study and discussion the Franciscan educational work in all its departments;

c) To offer means and incentives toward the advancement of learning and the pursuit of literary work among the Friars.

ARTICLE II.

DEPARTMENTS.

SECTION 1. The Conference shall consist of three departments: The Classical, the Philosophical, and the Theological Department.

ARTICLE III.

OFFICERS AND THEIR ELECTION.

SECTION 1. The officers of the Conference shall be a President, a Vice-President, and a Secretary.

SECTION 2. These officers shall be elected separately, by secret ballot, in the last session of each convention, a simple majority

deciding the successful candidate. If, after two ballots, no election has been effected, the two having the greatest number of votes shall be the exclusive candidates in the third ballot. In case two candidates receive an equal number of votes, the senior Friar shall have the preference.

ARTICLE IV.

DUTIES OF OFFICERS.

SECTION 1. The President shall preside at all meetings of the Conference and of the Executive Board.

SECTION 2. The Vice-President shall preside at these meetings in the absence of the President.

SECTION 3. The Secretary shall record and keep all matters pertaining to the Conference. He shall make due announcement of meetings and make the necessary preparations for them. He shall finish all the business of the previous meeting.

ARTICLE V.

THE EXECUTIVE BOARD.

SECTION 1. The three officers afore-mentioned shall ex officio constitute an Executive Board.

SECTION 2. The Executive Board shall have the management of the affairs of the Conference. It shall be invested with power to make regulations regarding the writing, reading, and publishing of the papers of the Conference meetings.

SECTION 3. It shall interpret the Constitution, By-Laws, and Regulations of the Conference and, in matters of dispute, its decision shall be final. It shall also have power to appoint the various committees of the Conference.

SECTION 4. The outgoing officers shall finish all the business of the previous convention.

ARTICLE VI.

CONVENTIONS.

SECTION 1. The Conference shall convene at such time, place, and interval, as may be determined by the Very Rev. Provincials in their annual meetings.

ARTICLE VII.

AMENDMENTS.

SECTION 1. This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote in any general session of the Conference, provided such amendment has been presented in writing and announced in a previous general session.

ARTICLE VIII.

By-LAWS.

SECTION 1. By-Laws which are not inconsistent with this Constitution may be adopted by a majority vote in any general session of the Conference.

OFFICERS
OF THE
Franciscan Educational Conference.

PROVINCIAL SUPERIORS.

VERY REV. FR. FRANCIS MANEL, O. F. M., Pulaski, Wis.
VERY REV. FR. JAMES MERIGHI, O. F. M., New York, N. Y.
VERY REV. FR. HUGOLINUS STORFF, San Francisco, Cal.
VERY REV. FR. MATHIAS FAUST, O. F. M., New York, N. Y.
VERY REV. FR. SAMUEL MACKE, O. F. M., St. Louis, Mo.
VERY REV. FR. RUDOLPH BONNER, O. F. M., Cincinnati, O.

OFFICERS OF THE CONFERENCE.

President:

REV. FR. THOMAS PLASSMAN, O. F. M.,
St. Bonaventure Seminary, Allegany, N. Y.

Vice-President:

REV. FR. MARTIN STRUB, O. F. M.,
St. Anthony Monastery, St. Louis, Mo.

Secretary:

REV. FR. URBAN FREUNDT, O. F. M.,
St. Francis Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Address all communications to the Rev. Secretary, 1615 Vine Street,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

LC
495
F7F7
v.1
1919

Franciscan Educational
Conference.
Report of the annual
meeting

ISSUED TO

LC
495
F7F7
v.1
1919

353319

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

GTU Library



3 2400 00090 5905

